

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

PUBLIC ROUNDTABLE TO DISCUSS INTERNATIONAL
ISSUES RELATING TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TITLE VII
OF THE DODD-FRANK ACT

Washington, D.C.

Monday, August 1, 2011

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 (9:00 a.m.)

3 MS. MESA: Good morning. I want to
4 thank all of you for being here today on the
5 Roundtable on International Issues relating to
6 Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act. I'm going to
7 make a few opening remarks and allow my colleagues
8 at the CFTC and SEC to do the same before we start
9 Panel 1.

10 The CFTC has been hard at work proposing
11 rules required to implement Title VII of the
12 Dodd-Frank Act relating to swaps oversight
13 reforms. We've heard from the industry in formal
14 and informal comments about international issues
15 and concerns relating to implementation of the
16 Dodd-Frank Act. We look forward to your input on
17 not just the issues, but also potential solutions.

18 Although each of our agencies has
19 different statutory provisions regarding the
20 international reach of Title VII, we have a
21 similar need to address the scope of our reach.
22 722(d) of the Dodd-Frank Act states that

1 provisions of the Act relating to CFTC regulated
2 swaps shall not apply to activities outside the
3 U.S. unless those activities, one, have a direct
4 and significant connection with activities on or
5 affect on commerce of the U.S.; or, two,
6 contravene the rules and regulations promulgated
7 by the CFTC as necessary or appropriate to prevent
8 evasion of the Dodd-Frank Act. I realize the
9 swaps industry is waiting for guidance on this
10 provision as the CFTC's application of it is
11 important in light of the global nature of the
12 swaps market.

13 The CFTC has a history of working out
14 solutions to international issues. For example,
15 for many years we have relied on foreign
16 regulators to regulate foreign intermediaries and
17 exchanges if they have comparable regulation.
18 These programs are based in part on the fact that
19 the participants, the products and the
20 infrastructure are all foreign. The swaps market
21 is more complex. Moreover, we have different and
22 in some cases more limited authority to provide

1 exemptions or recognition abroad under Title VII.

2 Before I turn it over to Dan Berkovitz,

3 I would like to give a short review of the day.

4 We have three panels that will consider the

5 international issues relating to the Dodd-Frank

6 Act. Panel 1 addresses cross-border transactions.

7 The first panel is intending to address issues

8 relating to when transactions should be subject to

9 U.S. regulation. In this regard, it will be

10 helpful to hear from panel members on how our

11 respective agencies should define the words direct

12 and significant as used by 722(d) of the

13 Dodd-Frank Act. We also want to see if it would

14 be useful and necessary to define U.S. persons and

15 if so how should we define U.S. persons. Finally,

16 there are certain things that apply to all persons

17 under the Dodd-Frank Act including clearing,

18 trading and reporting and we would like to hear

19 about those requirements under this panel.

20 The second panel although similar to the

21 first panel is regarding global entities. We hope

22 to ask panelists about issues of the level of

1 activity that would have a direct and significant
2 effect on U.S. commerce thus triggering
3 registration as a swap dealer or major swap
4 participant. There are specific issues we'd like
5 to hear about relating to subsidiaries, branches
6 and affiliates of U.S. firms and the requirements
7 that should apply.

8 Finally, Panel 3 addresses market
9 infrastructure. It's our final panel and we want
10 to cover clearinghouses, trading venues such as
11 swap execution facilities, securities swaps
12 execution facilities on foreign exchanges and
13 trade repositories. With respect to all types of
14 market infrastructure, we are interested in your
15 views on the differences between regulatory
16 requirements that would make it difficult or
17 impractical for a global entity to comply with
18 both U.S. and foreign requirements and whether
19 there are competitive issues or concerns that we
20 should take into account.

21 We have a lot of material to cover and I
22 look forward to today's discussion. I appreciate

1 the thoughtful comments we've received so far, and
2 now I'll turn it over to Dan Berkovitz for some
3 comments.

4 MR. BERKOVITZ: Good morning, and thank
5 you, Jackie. Good morning, panelists, my
6 colleagues at the CFTC, the SEC and members of the
7 public. Before I provide a few remarks, I'd like
8 to thank the staffs of both commissions, both the
9 CFTC and the SEC, for organizing today's
10 roundtable. I'd also like to thank the panelists
11 for agreeing to participate, sharing their
12 perspective and taking the time to participate on
13 the panel today as we discuss the extraterritorial
14 application of the new regulatory landscape for
15 swaps transactions under the Dodd-Frank Wall
16 Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

17 Since the passage of the Act, CFTC staff
18 has held many meetings with market participants
19 and has received hundreds of comment letters, many
20 of which have focused on the extraterritorial
21 application of the Act and the CFTC's rules
22 promulgated thereunder. Under our transparency

1 policy, comment letters and summaries of these
2 meetings are all posted on the CFTC website.

3 During these meetings and in the comment
4 letters, market participants have raised concerns
5 regarding how the United States and other
6 jurisdictions will apply supervisory or regulatory
7 responsibilities for swap entities, trading
8 platforms, trade repositories and swaps
9 transactions that span multiple jurisdictions. I
10 can assure you that both Commissions are working
11 diligently to implement needed reforms in the
12 swaps market and are actively consulting and
13 coordinating with each other and international
14 regulators to promote robust and consistent
15 standards. In "Morrison v. National Australia
16 Bank," the Supreme Court took note of the
17 longstanding principle of American law that unless
18 Congress clearly expresses an affirmative
19 intention to give a statute extraterritorial
20 effect, we must presume it is primarily concerned
21 with domestic conditions. The Dodd-Frank Act
22 expresses clear congressional intent that it apply

1 to certain extraterritorial activities. Section
2 722(d) of the agency Act states that the
3 provisions of the Act relating to swaps shall not
4 apply to activities outside the U.S. unless those
5 activities have, "A direct and significant
6 connection with activities in or effect on
7 commerce of the United States or those activities
8 are intended to contravene the Act or the CFTC's
9 regulations promulgated thereunder."

10 A key inquiry therefore is to determine
11 which activities outside the U.S. meet these
12 tests. This is not our only inquiry, however. As
13 the Commission noted in the proposed rule
14 regarding registration of entities, considerations
15 of international comity also play a role in
16 determining the proper scope of extraterritorial
17 application of federal statutes. We must also
18 consider the circumstances in which international
19 comity may affect the application of Dodd-Frank
20 provisions extraterritorially and how much
21 considerations will affect the application of the
22 Act outside the U.S. I am hopeful that today's

1 roundtable will help inform the Commission not
2 only on the panelists' views of the ultimate
3 questions of how Dodd-Frank should apply
4 extraterritorially, but also of the process that
5 the Commission should use to make these
6 determinations.

7 I personally am co-moderating today's
8 second panel which will focus on global entities.
9 In several comment letters filed in response to
10 the CFTC proposals defining and registering swap
11 dealers and major swap participants, commenters
12 have emphasized the importance of establishing an
13 appropriate regulatory framework for the
14 cross-border swaps activities of U.S. and foreign
15 banks. The CFTC recognizes that defining the
16 scope of the Dodd-Frank Act with respect to the
17 cross-border activities of U.S. and foreign banks
18 is crucial to preserving the continuity of global
19 business operations and the risk management tools
20 that swaps provide. It is necessary that we
21 accomplish the overall objectives of improving
22 transparency, mitigating systemic risk and

1 protecting against market abuse in the swaps
2 markets, and with these objectives in mind we are
3 asking these questions regarding extraterritorial
4 application.

5 Today's roundtable will play a
6 significant part in achieving these objectives.
7 That is why I look forward to our dialogue on
8 these important issues and am confident that staff
9 will be informed by the remarks of today's
10 panelists. Thank you very much.

11 MS. MESA: Thanks, Dan. Now I'm going
12 to allow Ethiopis Tafara, Director of the Office
13 of International Affairs at the SEC to also
14 provide some remarks.

15 MR. TAFARA: Good morning. I'm Ethiopis
16 Tafara, Director of the Office of International
17 Affairs at the SEC and on behalf of SEC staff I'd
18 like to welcome you to this joint SEC/CFTC
19 roundtable on international issues relating to the
20 implementation to Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act.

21 I'd like to start off by thanking my
22 colleagues here at the CFTC for hosting today's

1 roundtable and staff at the CFTC and SEC who
2 tirelessly worked together in organizing the
3 program. I also would like to thank all of the
4 panelists for their participation in today's
5 discussion. We appreciate your willingness to be
6 here and to share your thoughts and perspective on
7 the cross-border issues arising from Title VII of
8 the Dodd-Frank Act.

9 These roundtables are immensely helpful
10 as they give us the opportunity to hear firsthand
11 how our rulemaking activities may impact you, the
12 market participants, investors and other members
13 of the public. In turn, your comments will assist
14 in developing approaches that will enhance the
15 efficiency of the cross-border derivatives market
16 while advancing our mission of protecting
17 investors, ensuring the maintenance of safe, fair
18 and honest markets and facilitating capital
19 formation. Before I make a few remarks about
20 today's roundtable, I'd like to remind everyone
21 that the views we express today are our own and do
22 not reflect the views of the Commission, the

1 Commissioners or our fellow staff members and I
2 think that should apply throughout the day for all
3 of us from the regulatory agencies.

4 The purpose of the roundtable is to
5 explore the international issues raised by new
6 CFTC and SEC rules to regulate the swaps and
7 securities-based swap markets. The
8 interconnection of markets around the world has
9 opened a new frontier. It is true that our
10 capital markets have always had an international
11 component in that cross-border transactions have
12 always been with us. But it's the exponential
13 advances in computer and telecommunication
14 technologies that have altered the dimension. The
15 promises of this new frontier are many. These
16 promises include lower transaction costs, greater
17 choice and greater competition among financial
18 service providers to the benefit of end users.
19 But this new frontier also presents risks. We
20 must keep in mind that as national markets become
21 integrated, global risks become domestic risks.
22 The cross-border consequences of the Asia crisis

1 of 1997 and the more recent subprime crisis are
2 evidence of that fact.

3 Previous regulatory approaches to
4 cross-border financial services were devised when
5 the world was a different place and markets were
6 more self-contained and isolated from the outside
7 world. One approach for dealing with this new
8 environment is isolation. We can try to seal our
9 borders. Much like the sheriffs of old required
10 all strangers to check in upon approval, we can
11 insist that all entities whether foreign or
12 domestic providing financial services for products
13 come fully under our regulatory control in every
14 detail. We might also be tempted to open up the
15 town gates and let everyone in who wishes to do
16 business with our citizens, declare caveat emptor
17 and accept the resulting playing field. Neither
18 of these approaches is economically efficient and
19 both seriously test our ability to meet our
20 regulatory charge.

21 International collaboration is a third
22 and likely better alternative. We're well aware

1 that we will be regulating a market that is
2 already global in nature. First, the main players
3 in the market are global. Currently, large banks
4 and other financial institutions dominate the
5 derivatives markets. These firms have offices,
6 branches, subsidiaries and affiliates in multiple
7 jurisdictions and serve clients and customers
8 around the world. At the same time, key market
9 infrastructure entities such as exchanges, trading
10 platforms and clearinghouses increasingly serve an
11 international customer base and compete on a
12 global level.

13 Second, a large portion of the
14 derivatives transactions engaged by U.S. persons
15 is cross-border. Federal Reserve economist Sally
16 Davies estimated in her 2008 study that 55 to 75
17 percent of U.S. banks' total exposure to
18 derivatives involved counterparties resident
19 outside the United States. More recent data from
20 the Bank for International Settlements supports
21 the conclusions that cross-border exposure remains
22 at the same levels today if not higher.

1 Third, we recognize that one of the
2 great advantages of derivatives products is that
3 derivatives can offer investors exposure to almost
4 any type of asset and in almost any market without
5 the need to take possession of such assets or be
6 fixed in a certain location and often at a lower
7 cost. It is this flexibility that makes
8 derivatives such popular financial instruments.
9 Thus we face a challenge in regulating
10 derivatives. We believe and Congress has
11 determined in the Dodd-Frank Act that the size and
12 importance of the derivatives markets require
13 robust regulation. Such regulation will improve
14 transparency, market efficiency, investor
15 protection and financial stability. However, the
16 global nature of derivatives markets means that
17 entities around the world have the ability to
18 significantly impact U.S. financial markets.

19 Let me conclude my opening remarks by
20 noting that while our roundtable consists only of
21 members of the public and market participants, the
22 SEC and CFTC are actively speaking with foreign

1 counterparts about many of the same issues being
2 discussed today. As you know, pursuant to the
3 G-20 commitment regarding the clearing, reporting
4 and trading of standardized OTC derivatives
5 contracts by the end of 2012, many foreign
6 jurisdictions are also drafting legislation and
7 implementing rules relating to derivatives. The
8 Dodd-Frank Act notes the importance in working to
9 ensure that the U.S. and other countries'
10 regulatory regimes are based on the same robust
11 international standards and to that end requires
12 the SEC and the CFTC to consult and coordinate
13 with foreign regulators on the establishment of
14 those standards where possible. In the last year,
15 the SEC and CFTC have engaged in regular
16 discussions with foreign counterparts on a
17 bilateral basis and through multilateral fora such
18 as the IOSCO Task Force on OTC Derivatives
19 Regulation which is currently drafting
20 international standards or derivatives regulation
21 in the area of clearing, reporting and
22 intermediary oversight. Our goal is to develop a

1 comprehensive approach to international issues
2 raised by Title VII that strikes balance between
3 facilitating robust an active global derivatives
4 market while remaining faithful to the spirit and
5 letter of the Dodd-Frank Act and vigorously
6 upholding our mandate to protect investors and
7 preserve the integrity of our markets. Today's
8 roundtable should help inform our work.

9 I again would like to thank our
10 distinguished panelists for their participation.
11 The insights that you provide today will be
12 extremely valuable to us as we finalize our
13 implementation of Title VII. Thank you.

14 MS. MESA: For final remarks I would
15 like to introduce Robert Cook who is Director of
16 Trading Markets at the SEC.

17 MR. COOK: Thank you, Jackie, and good
18 morning. I'm joined today by Brian Bussey who
19 heads up our Office of Derivatives Policy and
20 Trading Practices at the SEC in the Division of
21 Trading and Markets. I would like to briefly echo
22 the thanks that have already been given to our

1 panelists for taking their time to join us today.
2 We very much look forward to your insights and
3 recommendations. Also to echo the thanks to the
4 CFTC for hosting this event and to the staffs of
5 the two agencies for organizing it. I'd like to
6 make two very brief remarks before we begin.

7 One is that from our perspective, one of
8 the key areas that we look forward to hearing
9 discussion on is the detailed application of our
10 rules under Title VII to, what I'll call,
11 cross-border transactions. More specifically, how
12 the registration, reporting, mandatory clearing
13 and mandatory trading requirements should apply to
14 securities-based swap transactions that involve a
15 U.S. counterparty, a U.S. intermediary or that
16 otherwise involves U.S. jurisdictional means.
17 Second, we recognize the uncertainty that
18 currently exists in this area and, frankly, the
19 difficulties that places some of the international
20 institutions in that have operations in various
21 jurisdictions in and trying to plan for the
22 future. The Chairman of the SEC has stated in

1 recent congressional testimony that the SEC
2 intends to address the relevant international
3 issues holistically in a single proposal which
4 we're actively working on. This will allow market
5 participants to comment on our proposed approach
6 to cross-border transactions involving the U.S. as
7 an integrated whole. The roundtable discussion
8 today will help inform our thinking regarding this
9 proposal as will the various comments that we very
10 much appreciate having received to date through
11 our SEC mailbox. I believe there's also a comment
12 file that's been opened in connection with this
13 roundtable that people should feel free to submit
14 comments to to help inform the thinking of both
15 agencies. Again, thank you for joining us today
16 and we look forward to your participation.

17 MS. MESA: Thank you. Welcome Panel 1.
18 I would like to take a moment for you to do
19 self-introductions. If you could introduce who
20 you are and who you're with and then we'll
21 formally get started. Can we start right here at
22 the end with you?

1 MR. REILLY: I'm Bob Reilly from Shell
2 Trading, and as of last Friday, Shell had 1,144
3 subsidiaries operating in 105 countries so
4 extraterritorial issues and issues involving
5 inter-affiliate transactions is very important to
6 us. Thank you for letting me be here today.

7 MS. MESA: Thank you. Also as a
8 reminder, if you can speak into your microphone,
9 that will help the whole room to hear.

10 MR. NICHOLAS: John Nicholas, Newedge.
11 Thank you.

12 MR. MANSFIELD: Bill Mansfield with
13 Rabobank, a global bank located in the
14 Netherlands. I'm responsible for the capital
15 market activities and the financial market
16 activities in the Americas region.

17 MR. KLEJNA: Dennis Klejna, MF Global.

18 MR. KELLY: David Kelly from UBS.

19 MR. RIGGS: Tom Riggs from Goldman
20 Sachs.

21 MR. STANLEY: Marcus Stanley, Americans
22 for Financial Reform.

1 MR. TURBEVILLE: Wally Turbeville,
2 Better Markets, a nonprofit, nonpartisan
3 organization whose mission is to express the
4 public interest in regard to reform.

5 MR. ZUBROD: Luke Zubrod, Chatham
6 Financial. Chatham is an adviser to about a
7 thousand end users in the U.S., Europe and Asia.

8 MS. MESA: One person who didn't give a
9 formal introduction sitting on my left is Ananda
10 Radhakrishnan who is Director of our Clearing and
11 Intermediary Oversight Division.

12 For Panel 1, I made some introductory
13 remarks earlier that I think what is important
14 regarding cross-border transactions perhaps as a
15 first step is whether or not the CFTC and SEC need
16 to have a definition for "U.S. Persons." Many of
17 the rules may relate to whether or not you are a
18 U.S. person. I think there are differing
19 definitions of U.S. person for the SEC and the
20 CFTC. My first question is first do you panelists
21 think that we need a definition for U.S. person
22 and if we do what is your recommendation for that

1 definition?

2 MR. NICHOLAS: Thanks, Jackie. Yes, I
3 think it would be useful to have a definition of
4 U.S. person, but I think you hit the nail on the
5 head when you noted that the SEC and CFTC already
6 have different definitions. I believe the SEC
7 under Reg S has one definition which I also think
8 is used for 15(a)(6) purposes, and then the CFTC
9 has another definition. Two comments in that
10 respect. One is I think it would be useful to the
11 extent possible to try to harmonize the
12 definitions. I know that harmonization in
13 securities and futures law is one of the dictates
14 that we're supposed to follow.

15 The other one is I think that in general
16 the definition should take into account the
17 differences between funds and nonfunds, funds
18 having potentially to the extent there's a
19 look-through requirement that it be a relatively
20 low threshold, and to the extent that there's not
21 a look-through requirement that it be based on the
22 headquarters of the entity.

1 MR. TURBEVILLE: The question of whether
2 there should be a definition or not, going back to
3 that, should be measured by what's convenient for
4 folks in the business and also needs to be looked
5 at in the context of the statute which is to me
6 the guiding light as opposed to convenience,
7 although, convenience is an important thing of
8 course. I look at Section 722 and 772 of the
9 statute and it seems to me that one might look to
10 those provisions for guidance in definition. 722
11 relates to the SEC, describes activities that have
12 a direct and significant connection with the
13 activities and/or effect on commerce of the U.S.
14 That would suggest to me that activities-based
15 analysis is quite important. 772 is somewhat
16 different. It talks about business being
17 conducted in securities-based swaps beyond the
18 jurisdiction of the U.S. so that it's a
19 business-based orientation. I'm curious in that
20 while it might be convenient to categorize
21 jurisdiction by the way companies are organized,
22 it would seem it's more likely to be productive

1 under the terms of the statute by looking at what
2 their activities are and what their business is
3 and whether a company is organized in a certain
4 place may not be so relevant as what their
5 activities are and what their businesses are. For
6 instance, a parent who guarantees all the
7 activities of a subsidiary that may be not U.S.
8 based and combines all of the swaps in a common
9 book, uses common systems and management and those
10 kinds of things, all of those to me would be
11 indicia of what the statute was intended to govern
12 and show that the whole purpose may be very
13 different from other statutes or other regulatory
14 regimes, the Fed and others, the SEC and CFTC. So
15 I would go back to those sections and look at
16 what's substantively going on.

17 MR. RIGGS: Thank you. First of all, we
18 do need a definition obviously. Since the SEC and
19 the CFTC already have definitions, I assume that
20 you would work with what you have and not start
21 from scratch. I think it's important, and I know
22 you guys are going to focus on this, the

1 definition for futures and securities have existed
2 with differences because those markets are quite
3 different. Now if you have a single name credit
4 derivative and an index credit derivative with the
5 same counterparty under the same agreement to be a
6 U.S. person for one of the transactions and not a
7 U.S. person for the other transaction is just not
8 tenable so that it's a high priority more than
9 ever on the SEC and the CFTC harmonizing that
10 definition. And more importantly as well,
11 whatever the definition is, it needs to be
12 harmonized internationally so you don't fall into
13 a situation where someone is a U.S. person for
14 U.S. rules and also an European person for the
15 European rules, and again we get back to the issue
16 of having potentially conflicting multiple sets of
17 rules applying to the same person.

18 MS. MESA: Luke?

19 MR. ZUBROD: End users are primarily
20 concerned with being able to continue to
21 efficiently and effectively manage their risks and
22 I think contributing to that cause is being

1 subject to a single set of clear rules to the
2 extent practicable in any given circumstance. So
3 I think clearly defining U.S. person will
4 contribute to this clarity though international
5 coordination is also essential for the purposes of
6 achieving harmony in the absence of duplicativity.

7 I think at a minimum we believe it would
8 be helpful to clarify what does not constitute a
9 U.S. person. A foreign subsidiary of a U.S.
10 person should not be a U.S. person if it has no
11 significant connection to the U.S. and we believe
12 it's important that the mere ownership or
13 guarantee by a U.S. parent should not form the
14 sole basis for determining that a foreign
15 subsidiary has a significant connection to U.S.
16 law. It's important that U.S. law acknowledge
17 that many U.S. companies set up foreign
18 subsidiaries not for the purposes of evasion but,
19 rather, because it makes good business sense in
20 operating a regular business. These subsidiaries
21 may be physically located abroad and have business
22 operations abroad, et cetera, and will thus be

1 subject to regulatory requirements from foreign
2 regulators. I think one important guiding
3 principle should be that if you're subject to
4 regulation elsewhere, you shouldn't be subject to
5 the U.S.'s regulatory regime as well. Though I
6 think an important consideration in establishing
7 this principle is working through timing
8 considerations. To the extent that the U.S.'s
9 regulatory regime will become effective first, the
10 fact that other countries or other jurisdictions
11 have not yet completed their regulations and
12 should not de facto then subject that entity to
13 U.S. law. So I think coming up with a mechanism
14 that accommodates timing differences relative to
15 the implementation of regulations in multiple
16 jurisdictions is important.

17 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: That's a big issue
18 for us, or for me anyway, and this argument has
19 been made before, wait until country X finishes.
20 What that means is that if we did that, we are
21 going to peg ourselves the last person, the last
22 jurisdiction that finalizes these rules so the

1 concern we have is you've got a statute out there,
2 you've got an obligation to finish regulations in
3 1 year, which we didn't do, but still it doesn't
4 mean that we're not going to finish it. So why
5 should we wait? That's a critical question. Why
6 should we wait until country X or country Y
7 finishes it 5 years down the road, because then
8 the momentum goes away. I realize some of you
9 want that momentum to go away. I think that's
10 fine. But from our perspective we can't let it go
11 away.

12 MR. ZUBROD: I would certainly
13 acknowledge that that's a complicated process to
14 figure out how to implement this, but I think it's
15 important to note that many of the activities that
16 could be subject to regulation in foreign
17 jurisdictions either have limited or no connection
18 to U.S. law and to the mitigation of systemic
19 risk. So I think balancing the desire to have a
20 robust regulatory framework should also be in
21 tension with the desire to ensure that end users
22 are not subject to regulation that does not

1 contribute materially to the mitigation of
2 systemic risk.

3 MS. MESA: Marcus?

4 MR. STANLEY: I wanted to respond to
5 that by saying that it's a good thing to avoid
6 duplicative or multiple regulatory regimes and
7 where it's possible it should certainly be done,
8 but it's not a statutory goal as I see it. The
9 goals of the statute are pretty clear, and to me
10 should take precedence over some of these issues,
11 and that's protecting the U.S. economy from risk
12 and from exposure. One thing, this issue of
13 foreign subsidiaries has also come up of course in
14 margin requirements and in comments on the
15 prudential regulators' rules. One thing I don't
16 see in these comments is any explanation of how
17 the U.S. parent is protected from losses in the
18 subsidiary. To me if the U.S. parent is going to
19 be responsible for the subsidiary's losses, that's
20 a connection to the U.S. economy right there. We
21 have seen derivatives losses spread
22 internationally before. To comment on the timing

1 to reinforce what the gentleman at the end said,
2 it seems to me there's a certain first mover
3 advantage here. If you can be the one to get out
4 the details of our rules first then there may be a
5 tendency for other countries to follow you and I'm
6 an "America first" kind of guy so I think there
7 are some advantages to that especially when we're
8 looking at a situation where the whole G-20
9 committed in 2009 to a similar set of conceptual
10 goals, so we're all following the same path here
11 and there might be advantages to being the first
12 to get the details of that path in.

13 MS. MESA: Bill?

14 MR. MANSFIELD: A comment back to not
15 waiting for the rest of the world. I think that's
16 a legitimate concern, but I also think that these
17 rules are complex and I think the international
18 markets are complex. I think we need to do it
19 carefully. I think we need to take our time. I
20 think the U.S. regulators can set the standard
21 with regard to how they expect swaps to be
22 regulated and derivatives to be regulated, and

1 they can watch the rest of the world follow suit
2 or not and if they don't, it's within your purview
3 to further broaden your scope. It's a legitimate
4 concern, but I do think that we need to carefully
5 implement these rules and regs over a period of
6 time and we need to see how other international
7 regulators are implementing similar types of
8 rules.

9 Back to U.S. person, I think as to the
10 definition, I think I'm somewhat opposed to Wally.
11 I think the definition for U.S. person is more
12 transactional. How I think about it is what
13 transactions are in scope and I don't think of it
14 as an entity-level type of definition. I hear
15 Marcus and it's a correct concern, but how about
16 the risk everywhere and what does that mean? I
17 think to take that a step further, the risk of an
18 institution isn't just derivatives. The risk of
19 an institution is the lending business, it's the
20 deposit taking business, it's all the other
21 businesses in Robobank's example that an
22 international bank will engage in. So you can't

1 just say, I need to regulate all of these
2 derivatives because that's going to make them safe
3 and sound. You need to take a very holistic
4 approach with regard to regulating the risk of an
5 institution and that's when we talk to the
6 prudential regulator that will look at all of our
7 risk including derivatives.

8 MS. MESA: Ethiopia?

9 MR. TAFARA: I think it would be
10 particularly helpful if people could be specific
11 as to the consequences of not waiting. I've heard
12 general statements as to the need to wait in the
13 interests I guess of a level playing field, but
14 the question that comes to my mind is what would
15 the specific consequences be of not waiting? One.
16 Two, I wonder whether or not it doesn't make some
17 sense to draw a distinction between conflicting
18 requirements and duplicative requirements.
19 Conflicting requirements put in the position of
20 not being able to comply with different sets of
21 rules at the same time. Duplicative requirements
22 are of a different nature and they have a cost and

1 they have varying costs depending on the nature of
2 the duplication. I think it would be useful and
3 I'd like to hear whether or not it is your view
4 that there is a difference between those two and
5 whether or not duplicative requirements are
6 actually of much lesser concern than conflicting
7 requirements.

8 MS. MESA: I know I have a few questions
9 out there and your names have been up for a while.
10 Dennis?

11 MR. KLEJNA: I think it's inarguable the
12 strictly legal point that Ananda makes, but I
13 really do agree with the general sentiment as to
14 what is going to be alternative. We've heard
15 repeatedly and it's clearly true that the
16 Commissions are working aggressively with foreign
17 regulators to try to get these things to be as
18 consistent as possible. The statute is explicit
19 too about the ability to rely on comparable
20 regulation which this agency has done for a
21 generation. So inevitably, and this is the timing
22 issue, there is going to be a time when there is

1 going to be in all likelihood some meaningful
2 comparable regulation. I wish I had an exact
3 answer for Ananda's question because I understand
4 the point that he has the statute, but I do think
5 that there's room within the statute, and we all
6 know because we've had separate talks previously
7 about particular problems for example when a
8 non-U.S. entity has become designated as a
9 clearing organization and the provision in the
10 statute that if you're going to clear you've got
11 to be a registered FCM that goes to the heart of
12 the whole omnibus concept that's worked so
13 efficiently in the Part 30 regime.

14 But the alternative to not waiting is
15 having firms comply and do whatever structural or
16 organizational alterations are necessary to meet
17 the American requirements and then in a matter of
18 time having to either change them or having to
19 think about the opportunity of changing them and
20 that's an expensive process. I guess I wonder if
21 we can't think of a way in which -- it's like this
22 definition of U.S. person. To me the most

1 important thing might be whatever the definition
2 is, is there a way to pick out the elements of
3 regulation that are really the goal of the statute
4 and the goal of the G-20 undertaking and come up
5 with a way, even in a developing way, that through
6 information sharing, through reporting, that while
7 this process is ongoing in these other
8 jurisdictions, the American regulators could reach
9 an appropriate level of satisfaction that they
10 have an idea of what's going on, that the thrust
11 of Dodd-Frank is not being evaded. This is all
12 very, I know, amorphous sounding stuff, but the
13 timing issue is really a critical one and maybe if
14 we just thought in terms of the different pieces
15 of the regime that Dodd-Frank contemplates and
16 figure out a different way to reach a level of
17 satisfaction we could maybe find a way to bridge
18 this timing gap.

19 MS. MESA: David, why don't you take the
20 next comment and then we'll go to Brian?

21 MR. KELLY: You stole a fair amount of
22 my thunder, actually. One, I think you have a

1 fair amount of flexibility, you are going to be
2 first, you're going to regulate U.S. markets and
3 that will happen well before Europe and some of
4 the other countries are finished, but you can be
5 cautious about how you define the extraterritorial
6 scope because you do have to make a finding that
7 what you're looking at has a direct and
8 significant effect in the United States. And I
9 think if you look at some of the other legal areas
10 where that language has been used, particularly in
11 antitrust, it is actually fairly narrowly
12 construed. So I think you have the flexibility to
13 do what you need to do for your core markets in
14 the United States, to tread carefully
15 extraterritorially. For a number of the firms
16 around the table who are large global firms, we
17 have a very complicated implementation job ahead
18 of us knowing what we have to implement and to
19 whom and to what transactions your rules apply is
20 absolutely critical for us. And I think you have
21 flexibility to define a reasonable scope and to
22 work closely with the regulators in other

1 countries as they develop their rules as the
2 statute contemplates. I agree with Ethiopis that,
3 yes, there are conflicts and they're duplicative.
4 At the simplest level, you can't clear the same
5 trade in two different places. Duplicative trade
6 reporting, as an example of a duplication, will be
7 expensive. I think it will probably degrade the
8 quality of information that's available to you as
9 regulators if we have to report the same trade to
10 two different transaction repositories.

11 MS. MESA: Let's take some more and try
12 to clear through this issue. Suparna?

13 MS. VEDBRAT: To answer your question on
14 what may be an impact if we don't wait for the
15 harmonization, we have a concern that if we are
16 unable to achieve a high degree of harmonization
17 both in the rules themselves as well as in timing,
18 then the deep and liquid derivative markets that
19 we currently have will get fragmented and that's
20 going to impact competitive pricing that clients
21 receive today. It's important for us that the
22 U.S. remains a competitive trading jurisdiction.

1 There are many investment dollars that must remain
2 in the U.S. and we don't want them to be
3 disadvantaged because we were the first to put
4 forward the rules and they may overall impact the
5 way we invest.

6 The other question related with U.S. --
7 and I think we all greatly benefit from clarity
8 within that definition because if you were to take
9 a case just as an example, if we were to trade a
10 foreign domiciled account with a foreign branch or
11 institution but it's managed by a U.S. manager or
12 it's a subdelegation to a U.S. manager then what
13 purview would that fall under? So that definition
14 would really help us to define how our business
15 model needs to change to accommodate all the rules
16 with the various differences.

17 MS. MESA: Thank you. Tom?

18 MR. RIGGS: I guess one another example,
19 Ethiopia, in particular is since we're focused on
20 the competitiveness of U.S. firms, one concern is
21 whether there's a first move disadvantage in fact
22 which is that while we're completely supportive if

1 going live in your timeframe with U.S. clients
2 however defined, one from a U.S. dealer
3 perspective is since it's very easy for clients
4 outside the U.S. to just go to somebody else
5 that's not a U.S. person or a sub of a U.S.
6 person, once you have this gap period between when
7 the U.S. goes live and the rest of the world goes
8 live creates a period in which business, client
9 relationships, liquidity, whatever flows somewhere
10 else, and then ultimately when the rest of the
11 world harmonizes with the U.S. approach, the
12 question is, can you get it back and then what's
13 happened in that interim period? It's highly
14 competitive and this isn't about dealers being
15 able to tell clients what to do, this is about
16 clients telling us what they're going to do so
17 that I think is a real point.

18 And to your point about obviously
19 duplicative is not as bad as inconsistent. The
20 industry has got a big lift to get clearing and
21 execution and trade reporting up and running and
22 obviously that's of primary importance and any

1 costs that slow that down from a policy
2 perspective, if you can avoid that, obviously that
3 would be a good thing to be as harmonized and
4 internationally consistent as possible and take
5 advantage of one method or type of reporting that
6 works for everybody.

7 MS. MESA: Wally and then Brian.

8 MR. TURBEVILLE: So much to talk about
9 and so little time. First, the whole issue of
10 standards and clarity. I suppose if I were
11 sitting up there I would be thinking in terms of
12 looking at the statutory things. By the way, you
13 may disagree with what I said about the standards,
14 I was reading from the statute. What I would do
15 is look at using examples. In other words, I
16 wouldn't try to tie down what is a U.S. entity or
17 non-U.S. entity when you have standards that you
18 can deal with in terms of what kind of business it
19 is or what kinds of activities they are.
20 Certainly examples would be helpful to give
21 people, pick a number, 99 percent of the certainty
22 that they need and the 1 percent that's on the

1 margin may or may not be coverable, but on the
2 other hand that might be just the one you need to
3 deal with.

4 The second issue that I think we should
5 drop back and think about is all these firms, I
6 did it myself, that's what I did for a living for
7 a while, participate in the derivatives market.
8 Derivatives are ephemeral, they defy the notion of
9 territoriality, they defy a lot of things -- they
10 defy understanding. And I think we have to
11 recognize that we can't wallow around in the
12 who-goes-first thing and end up in what is in
13 effect a race to the bottom or what would move
14 this whole thing toward the derivatives markets
15 being in an extralegal environment at the end of
16 the day as everybody waits for what's going to go
17 on. The fact is, I think that the duplicative
18 issue is important. I was in a briefing with
19 Senate staff on Friday where we were talking more
20 in terms of overlap rather than duplicative, but
21 that's the same point. I think that has to be
22 embraced because it's going to occur, and I think

1 one thing that industry needs to do is recognize
2 that the regulators are not foolish, they're not
3 here or in Europe or anywhere else, they're going
4 to deal with overlapping regulation and
5 overlapping regulation is inevitable in such an
6 ephemeral market and I think that's an important
7 thing to think through. Again, things that
8 require contrary behaviors are problematic, but
9 overlap and duplication is inevitable in a
10 marketplace like this.

11 Last, the whole issue of entity versus
12 transactional. I know the industry wants that. I
13 can't figure out what the justification of it is.
14 The statute gives a pathway to deal with these
15 issues and in my way of thinking there are
16 transactions that are jurisdictional that are
17 covered and then your behavior with respect to
18 those transactions might constitute you a swap
19 dealer, whether your country or origin is Pakistan
20 or the United States, you might become a major
21 swap participant. The question is whether the
22 transactions are jurisdictional and the activity

1 is jurisdictional and that's in the statute. So I
2 don't see some giant divide which would say
3 certain kinds of attributes of entities
4 categorically eliminate them from jurisdiction
5 under the statute. Maybe I'm missing something,
6 but the argument is made that way. I've read
7 every law firm paper I can find in terms of
8 comment. I can't find the justification for it
9 and maybe folks could enlighten us all.

10 MR. BUSSEY: Thank you. I wanted to
11 drill back down on something that Luke, Wally and
12 Marcus talked about a bit earlier which is about
13 foreign subs, both where there's just ownership
14 and then there's a guarantee. And I guess for
15 Wally and Marcus, let's take the situation of a
16 dealer in London that's owned by a U.S. entity,
17 just ownership, no guarantee, what's the concern?
18 I think I heard you suggest that that should be of
19 concern to U.S. regulators. What's the concern
20 there? Then on the guarantee side, why for
21 example is not the MSP category if you have a
22 U.S.-based parent guaranteeing a foreign sub you

1 would aggregate up I think under our proposal to
2 the parent company for purposes of MSP but you
3 wouldn't necessarily apply dealer regulation to
4 the foreign entity? And I guess Luke asking the
5 exact opposition question so I sound fair and
6 balanced, if a U.S. parent decides to guarantee
7 the activities of a foreign-based dealer, why
8 shouldn't that be within the purview of U.S.
9 regulators? Or asked a different way, why isn't
10 that a pathway to avoid Dodd-Frank? And I open
11 that up to the rest of you as well.

12 MR. STANLEY: I do think that in 2008 we
13 saw a number of balance sheet entities that didn't
14 have an explicit guarantee but had an implicit
15 guarantee for reputational reasons of the parent
16 company and that was an issue. Also I'm going to
17 confess to not being a lawyer now, but as I
18 understand it, it's also an issue in the laws of
19 various countries whether you can pierce the
20 corporate veil and get up to the parent even
21 without an explicit guarantee and what I wasn't
22 seeing in the industry comments is a specific

1 explanation of why that is not going to happen and
2 I would think that would be important. I'll leave
3 it there.

4 MR. TURBEVILLE: Everything I agree with
5 there in terms of guarantee. My familiarity with
6 doing swaps is if the swap is with an entity which
7 is guaranteed, it's the parent that you're dealing
8 with. Further, I think the key issues are what is
9 the business and what are the activities so that
10 there is more than just guarantee. There's is it
11 a composite book? Is it a combined book that
12 they're looking at? Are they sharing systems?
13 Are they sharing management? Is the decision
14 making and the strategy in common? I think those
15 are very pertinent issues and I think again to me
16 Dodd-Frank gives you the thrust of what you're
17 getting to that it's not just financial guarantee,
18 it's, is it all part of the same business, is the
19 activity the same because the effect on the
20 markets is important.

21 MR. BUSSEY: Are you suggesting that
22 it's not a guarantee alone or ownership alone is

1 enough, it's both that needs to be something more
2 like common systems?

3 MR. TURBEVILLE: No. What I'm saying is
4 beyond guarantee there are other issues,
5 either/or, it's a matrix of things.

6 MS. MESA: Bob, you've had your name up
7 for a while. Did you have a comments on Brian's
8 question or something previously?

9 MR. REILLY: Nothing on Brian's
10 question.

11 MS. MESA: Let's try to keep with this
12 one question and stay with the theme. David?

13 MR. KELLY: I'll put this in Ethiopia's
14 conflicts category and I'll take Shell as an
15 example. If Shell has a subsidiary in Germany and
16 I want to trade derivatives with it today, I would
17 do that through a German-organized entity or
18 another E.U. passported entity because derivatives
19 are a regulated activity in Europe. Neither of
20 those entities would otherwise likely to be
21 registered as swap dealers. So it's a reasonable
22 possibility that Shell trading in Germany would

1 not find a U.S. firm that could be a counterparty.
2 The way we are all organized today we are
3 generally going to have an E.U.-facing entity.
4 We're optimistic that in the MiFID revisions there
5 will be a greater accommodation for cross-border
6 activities into Europe, but I'm not sure that
7 reaching out with this broad a scope is going to
8 help that debate within Europe. So there's just a
9 plain conflict that we may not be able to deal
10 with Shell's non-U.S. subsidiaries.

11 MS. MESA: Luke?

12 MR. ZUBROD: Brian, with respect to your
13 question, I'll answer it from a policy
14 perspective, putting the end user hat on and maybe
15 we'll use margin as the sort of window through
16 which to examine this question. End users would
17 be concerned with the potential for a diminishment
18 of essentially good pricing or a degradation in
19 transparency that might occur from the scenario
20 which you describe. To put forth an example, if
21 we're a foreign subsidiary of a U.S. company
22 operating in Europe and if we have the ability to

1 trade with say Barclays and BNP Paribas and other
2 foreign banks and the ability to trade with the
3 foreign branch of a U.S. bank, if the requirements
4 on the foreign branch of the U.S. bank are more
5 severe than the requirements on the foreign bank,
6 it will certainly influence with whom we'll
7 transact. If those more severe requirements cause
8 us to avoid interacting with the foreign branch of
9 the U.S. bank, it could have the unfortunate
10 consequences of increasing the pricing or at least
11 the competitive dynamics that are available in
12 that particular situation. So I think that's a
13 policy concern that would be there for end users.

14 MS. MESA: On Brian's question, I'm
15 looking at Bill.

16 MR. MANSFIELD: I don't know if it's
17 specific to Brian's question, but it's related to
18 the general themes and that is starting with the
19 harmonization. Harmonization is happening and
20 that regulates not just derivatives but it
21 regulates the whole entity of a banking
22 organization. It includes new regulations with

1 regard to liquidity rules and regulations. So the
2 global rules are taking place. They're going into
3 effect. In Europe you have EMIR and, as was
4 mentioned, MiFID too that are going to regulate
5 the derivatives. So this harmonization of these
6 global markets is happening. It's not going to
7 happen at the same time and it's probably likely
8 going to be staged by different legal
9 jurisdictions.

10 The solution to that not happening at
11 the same time and having them all be the same from
12 my perspective isn't to take a global approach and
13 say then I'm going to regulate everything around
14 the world because that isn't up to my standards
15 and what I want to do. I think that's the wrong
16 approach to take with regard to concerns around
17 rules and regs within other legal jurisdictions.
18 The reason I think that is, it gets to the point
19 of if you do have conflicting rules. By nature if
20 there's a conflicting rule, then what do I do? Do
21 I not trade? Do I not offer that product?
22 Because if I do, I'm wrong here but I'm right here

1 -- but which one do I care about more? The whole
2 nature of conflicting rules with regard to
3 derivatives is a big one and I think that we need
4 to mindful that there will be conflicts, but will
5 these conflicts that exist in other regulatory
6 regimes be acceptable to U.S. regulators and my
7 guess is that they will because the conflicting
8 rules will be specific to those local markets.

9 MS. MESA: I want to finish Brian's
10 question on foreign subsidiaries ownership and
11 guarantees. Does anyone have one last comment?

12 MR. RIGGS: I would note that obviously
13 we're moving into a world in which we no longer
14 have unregulated activities or unregulated
15 entities. Everybody is going to be registered as
16 a swap dealer or regulated in the world in those
17 activities. All the holding companies are now
18 regulated and subject to prudential regulation.
19 And in particular, all of the swap-dealing
20 entities are now going to have their own capital
21 requirements. It strikes me that the guarantees
22 have ceased to be as relevant from a risk

1 perspective. Counterparties like them because
2 typically the guaranteeing entities are the ones
3 that have the rated debt which is a proxy for
4 understanding the credit rating of your
5 counterparty rather than having each entity around
6 the world have a stand-alone rating. But given
7 the capital requirements and other regulation of
8 all the swap dealers now it strikes me that the
9 guarantee issue from your perspective is less of
10 an issue than it was before.

11 MS. MESA: Dan, would you like to ask a
12 question?

13 MR. BERKOVITZ: Thank you, Jackie. Much
14 of the discussion is we've talked about various
15 results, what the result of the extraterritorial
16 application should be, how should it apply in this
17 circumstance or how should it apply in that
18 circumstance, transaction-based, entity-based or
19 whatever. Sitting here from the agency's
20 perspective, equally important for the result is
21 how do we get to the result. How are we going to
22 make those determinations and in what context? Is

1 this something that would be done through a
2 rulemaking? Should the agency say, here are the
3 various circumstances and here we are going to
4 apply our rules in these various circumstances.
5 The one issue with that approach is obviously
6 there are a variety of circumstances and a variety
7 of circumstances I've been through personally in a
8 number of meetings and there's a variety of
9 different structures and countries, and we're also
10 talking about global harmonization and waiting on
11 jurisdictions, but there are multiple
12 jurisdictions that we end up maybe waiting on, so
13 that there is not necessarily a one-size-fits-all
14 answer for the various jurisdictions. Or an
15 alternative approach is in a registration-specific
16 or a transaction-specific determination, the
17 agency has the flexibility to either make
18 determinations by rulemakings or by individual
19 adjudications and applicants could come to the
20 CFTC and say here is my bank and I'm on this
21 country with this type of regulation applicable.
22 I think these regulations should apply or

1 Dodd-Frank should apply to these transaction
2 requirements but my home regulation should apply
3 to these other types of requirements. That would
4 be a more individual determination based on
5 individual registration proceedings. For the
6 agencies that's a much more resource-intensive
7 determination. There is also much less certainty
8 for market participants as to the ultimate result,
9 but it could be more tailored. On the other hand,
10 a rulemaking approach could either by
11 overinclusive or underinclusive. I think in a
12 general approach it could be that some entities
13 could feel my specific situation doesn't
14 particularly apply to how the rule is being
15 developed. So we'd be interested in participants'
16 views on the method by which we should be
17 resolving some of these questions in addition to
18 the result to be achieved.

19 MS. MESA: John?

20 MR. NICHOLAS: Thanks, Jackie. Dan, in
21 answer to your question, it's a good question, I
22 think setting it out in a rulemaking is important

1 to give market participants a roadmap and some
2 clarity in terms of how to set up their business
3 and so forth. I think the agencies clearly have
4 the discretion to do that. I think the agencies
5 have the expertise and the expectation to do that.
6 What I would say in terms of general thoughts on
7 the matter is look to what is already in place.
8 Look to what has worked in the past. I think the
9 CFTC's Part 30 framework has worked. I think that
10 it held up very well during the financial crisis
11 and should be looked to as a guide. I understand
12 the differences between the swaps markets and the
13 futures markets, but I also think that the swaps
14 markets are clearly moving toward the futures
15 markets in terms of centralization of execution
16 and clearing which would probably make a little
17 more sense in terms of a Part 30 framework, and
18 not to discount the SEC's 15(a)(6) framework
19 either that also I think takes into account to a
20 certain extent comparability of foreign
21 regulation.

22 The other point I wanted to throw in

1 there is in terms of the language relating to a
2 significant and direct impact, I have to confess
3 that I haven't read the legislative intent on
4 that, but I wonder whether that may be more
5 related to a catch-all type provision for
6 enforcement purposes as opposed to language which
7 is set out to establish things like registration
8 and reporting requirements. Obviously the
9 agencies have to have broad enforcement authority,
10 but I'm not sure that that language is necessarily
11 put in the statute in terms of setting up the
12 initial regulatory structure. Thanks.

13 MS. MESA: Bill?

14 MR. MANSFIELD: Dan, I would certainly
15 with you and I think most participants in the swap
16 market would agree that having a clear guideline
17 as to how the market is going to work is
18 preferable to having bilateral discussions of this
19 is how I am and this is how I think I should do
20 it. I think the discussion we're having right now
21 is very direct toward that, and that's defining
22 what's in scope and if we define what's in scope,

1 clearly define what's in scope, then the
2 organizational aspects and the differences between
3 entities can be resolved. Again, defining what's
4 in scope is U.S. person. I think the Reg S
5 definition is one that has been cited as a good
6 reference to point with regard to the definition
7 of a U.S. person. I'm not a lawyer, but it seems
8 reasonable and logical to base the definition on
9 the scope of the transactions or what would be a
10 Reg S determination, and similar to John in that
11 direct and significant is something that's in
12 addition to this. I would think that it does give
13 the regulators and also the market participants
14 that we should determine when we see something
15 direct and significant and I think that would more
16 like a manipulative or fraudulent type of
17 activity. So we have a very high hurdle to
18 overcome with regard to direct and significant. I
19 think that having the definitions of a U.S. person
20 clearly defined is going to resolve a lot of the
21 issues with regard to the differences among
22 entities.

1 MS. MESA: Suparna?

2 MS. VEDBRAT: I second that more
3 harmonization and clarity in the rules themselves
4 perhaps maybe phased in on the effectiveness of
5 these rules is a better approach. If you were
6 consider the second alternative that was presented
7 which is highly customized, for an end user that
8 has many counterparties that they deal with, not
9 only would we have to understand their customized
10 structure, then we would have to overlay our own
11 account structure on top of that which could
12 become a very complex exercise.

13 MS. MESA: Wally?

14 MR. TURBEVILLE: I think that given the
15 nature of the swaps market and the derivatives
16 market and its breadth and the ephemeral stuff
17 that I was talking about earlier, it seems to me
18 that the right approach is to again embrace
19 overlap and duplicative so long as conflict is
20 taken into consideration which means that I think
21 the right approach is not to make some sort of
22 cosmic high-level definitional construct but,

1 rather, deal with the standards and say these
2 activities aren't included. The reason I'm saying
3 that is, while overlap if properly done and
4 internationally is inevitable and something to be
5 dealt with, gaps would be problematic because the
6 other part of the swaps market is it's very
7 portable and it's very easy to exploit gaps. So
8 what I would do is go with a broader sort of
9 approach but with some concrete examples to
10 provide people guidance.

11 One more thing real quick, the whole
12 issue of the materials I was reading and I'm sure
13 a lot of folks are familiar with it, it's not an
14 issue of manipulation of the market, it's really
15 the standards for extraterritorial application. I
16 get most of my learning from Sullivan & Cromwell
17 writing for the industry and that's what they were
18 thinking. I don't know. I got it from those
19 folks. I think those issues really do apply by
20 the way they were intended to apply to the
21 extraterritorial issue.

22 MS. MESA: I'm going to take one more on

1 this issue and then we're going move on. I know
2 you haven't had a chance to speak, Bob. Go ahead.

3 MR. REILLY: First, to Dan's point, you
4 can't do it transaction by transaction or entity
5 by entity. I think you have to set up categories
6 of different types of transactions. I think one
7 of the things you need to look at when you set up
8 those categories is the location of the underlying
9 product. Commodities are a little bit different
10 than financial products that we've heard a lot
11 about this morning. Commodities are tangible,
12 they're used by real people and they're used in
13 real places. So I think that you have to take
14 that into account when you think about what is
15 something that has a direct and significant impact
16 on U.S. commerce.

17 Going to David's example for just a
18 second, if we have a German subsidiary of UBS
19 dealing with a German subsidiary of Shell and
20 they're trading German fuel oil, I think it's
21 pretty clear that Title VII would not apply. On
22 the other hand, if trade is involving a U.S. bank,

1 say a German branch of a U.S. bank, then perhaps a
2 little bit closer call, but I would argue that if
3 we're talking about the underlying commodity being
4 German fuel oil, that should not a jurisdictional
5 transaction.

6 MS. MESA: I want to move on. I know a
7 lot of people want to keep going on this one.
8 Ananda?

9 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: One of the
10 considerations is the desire to treat people in
11 the same circumstance the same. What do I mean by
12 that? I'm going to pick two banks here, Goldman
13 Sachs and UBS. You're headquartered in
14 Switzerland and you're headquartered in New York.
15 Let's say the Commission were to say, Goldman
16 Sachs, you need to register the swap dealer and
17 let's say both of you do activities that bring you
18 within the definition of a swap dealer and the two
19 Commissions were to say, Goldman Sachs, you have
20 to register with us and with the SEC. UBS, you
21 don't have to because you're subject to regulation
22 in Europe. A question, is that fair? Because I

1 think that's one of the things that we have to
2 grapple with which is how do you treat people --
3 you choose to do business in a particular way.
4 Now I guess UBS could set up shop in the United
5 States and do it that way. That's up to you. But
6 I think from my perspective, that's a critical
7 element of what do the Commissions have to do
8 which is treat people the same.

9 MS. MESA: Tom and then Dennis.

10 MR. RIGGS: First of all, it's not fair.
11 But I think what we're saying is that with respect
12 to U.S. people, everybody is going to have to
13 comply with the rules whether they're based in
14 Switzerland, based in New York or wherever they're
15 based, so that's not in question. The issue is
16 with respect to activities outside the United
17 States. We have global entities with U.S. and
18 non-U.S. clients so how do you treat the non-U.S.
19 activities of these global entities?

20 From our perspective, the prudential
21 regulators' margin rule is very unfair. It's
22 asymmetric. It applies one set of rules to

1 U.S.-based organizations and a different set of
2 rules to non-U.S.-based organizations. We're not
3 sure why the activities of a non-U.S. bank who has
4 significant U.S. activities don't need to be
5 regulated but our offshore activities do. We
6 think that the rules should be fair. We think
7 everyone is going to have to comply with U.S.
8 rules. And with respect to the non-U.S. rules we
9 think there should be an even playing field
10 between U.S.-based firms and non-U.S. based firms
11 with respect to their non-U.S. activity.

12 MS. MESA: Dennis and then David.

13 MR. KELLY: I think that that's pretty
14 clear and I think it's important to have brought
15 that point out because if you're dealing with an
16 American resident counterparty then it's pretty
17 difficult to get yourself out of American
18 regulation. There may be some de minimis
19 exceptions to that, and by de minimis I don't mean
20 de minimis, minimis, minimis that's been proposed,
21 but that's really it. The rest of it really it
22 seems to me ought to be dealt with through some

1 information sharing and an aggressive use of
2 enforcement authority on this like, for example
3 market manipulation. And I do agree with Wally
4 and a little less with John about what this
5 language is intended in the statute. I think it
6 is a regulatory provision. I think the
7 Enforcement Division would consider that to be a
8 pretty constrained reach on its ability to go --
9 and certainly historically it's been much more
10 aggressive than that in terms of manipulating a
11 market. Personally, I don't know the difference
12 between German oil and American oil. I appreciate
13 the attempt to distinguish them, but I understand
14 from a manipulation on a market price standpoint
15 and from the enforcement ability, that's a
16 separate category. But my point is that that is
17 there and that is available and has been and will
18 continue to be. So if you're going to regulate
19 anybody who's dealing with an American resident
20 counterparty which is the what the bulk of this
21 really ought to be all about, then I think the
22 rest of it as difficult as it is, to me that's why

1 I keep coming back to the timing issue. The talk
2 about duplicative and conflicting to me would
3 almost be the good news at this point because that
4 would mean that there's something out there that
5 you can compare it to and we can make some
6 intelligent decisions about how to apply it.
7 We're not even there yet which is Ananda's point.
8 But I think that as I said before, if there are
9 ways to parcel out the elements of what you care
10 about, I think when you consider that this is a
11 great success for what the G-20 wanted. Everybody
12 in the universe agrees with this fundamentally or
13 at least generally that all regulators want to
14 force everything to clear, all regulators want
15 more transparency and that's where everybody is
16 going. So trying to accommodate a harmonized way,
17 and harmony is impossible really, but in a
18 mutual-reliance way of dealing with that when
19 everybody is sort of generally moving in the same
20 direction I think ought to be an achievable goal.

21 MS. MESA: David?

22 MR. KELLY: Responding more to Tom's

1 point, I think for internationally active
2 financial institutions, we think there should be a
3 level playing field so that if Goldman Sachs is
4 acting through its U.K. branch or a U.K.
5 subsidiary, the same rules ought to apply. We
6 care about it. Some foreign banks active in the
7 United States may well end up registering their
8 main bank as a swaps dealer in which case we would
9 expect if our London branch is dealing with a
10 French counterparty or a German counterparty that
11 it would generally not have to follow U.S. rules,
12 but if it's dealing with a U.S. counterparty,
13 absolutely. Every requirement applicable to a
14 swap dealer must be complied with. Without that I
15 think a number of institutions will run into
16 serious difficulties in how they structure their
17 operations certainly in the near-term and with
18 constraints on their operations in the
19 longer-term.

20 MS. MESA: Let's take one more. Wally?

21 MR. TURBEVILLE: Some great comments.

22 Dennis, especially that was a very wise discussion

1 of things. Tom was talking about the fairness and
2 fell into activities, and then Bob was talking
3 about physical commodities and how they're
4 different and I sort of put those things together.
5 It's kind of an interesting thing that really goes
6 to the issue that makes this so hard, that makes
7 it so that broad rules perhaps are best with
8 carve-outs. Petroleum products may be different
9 in Europe, but on the other hand, community index
10 funds shifts famously between West Texas
11 Intermediate and Brent in favor of Brent in
12 February which after that for whatever reason,
13 possibly for that reason itself, there was this
14 huge disparity between Brent and West Texas
15 Intermediate and prices changed on West Texas
16 Intermediate oil in the United States. My point
17 being, activities in physical and not in our
18 country have a huge effect back into this market.
19 So I think that really speaks to the question of
20 how extraterritoriality has to be flexible enough
21 to deal with the kinds of effects that come back
22 into the market and because of the way swaps are

1 structured and the marketplace has grown up, I
2 think flexibility is really called for and we
3 would really endorse that as a concept and then
4 carve-outs for activities that do seem to be
5 nonjurisdictional.

6 MR. COOK: We've spent a lot of time
7 talking about who should be and who should not be
8 a U.S. person and it feels a little bit like it's
9 an all-or-nothing thing, that we haven't been very
10 nuanced I think about whether are you in for all
11 requirements. So I wanted to ask whether that's
12 intentional? Do you believe that if you're in,
13 you're in for everything? We have a number of
14 requirements that are in play here. One is the
15 entity registration and the entity conduct rules.
16 Another is the trade reporting rules. We have
17 mandatory trading requirements. We have mandatory
18 clearing requirements. Should the way we think
19 about who is subject to those rules differ based
20 on -- between those rules or are you thinking that
21 once you're in the regime, you're in for all
22 purposes?

1 MS. MESA: Marcus?

2 MR. STANLEY: I think this goes back to
3 something that I think John was saying earlier
4 when he was talking about the
5 direct-and-significant test possibly not applying
6 to certain kinds of registration or structure and
7 reporting, that it was more limited. I disagree
8 with what he was saying in that case. I think the
9 direct-and-significant test goes to the overall
10 goals of the statute and I think what you want to
11 do is you want to trace back the various
12 requirements to the key underlying goals of the
13 statute which involve transparency and systemic
14 stability. So I don't think anybody really cares
15 if a company is reporting some information about
16 its swap on page 4 on the German form when it
17 would be page 2 on the U.S. form, but you care a
18 lot about whether it's reporting all the necessary
19 information on that form because that goes to the
20 transparency issue and this to me is why it's so
21 potentially worrisome that people are talking
22 about exempting from margin requirements that goes

1 directly -- margining uncleared derivatives goes
2 very directly to the stability requirement.

3 I also want to mention a few things that
4 people have been saying on this
5 direct-and-significant connection, that there
6 seems to be sort of an attempt to inflate how
7 important that connection has to be. We heard the
8 word "dramatic" used before. I think that was
9 David and that's not in the statute. And the
10 statute itself says a direct-and-significant
11 connection with activities in or affect on, so
12 that affect on is also important to think about.

13 One last point, something Suparna said
14 before and I think often gets said in connection
15 with this discussion is that the argument is made
16 that we need to limit our extraterritorial reach
17 in order to preserve investment dollars that we
18 want to remain in the U.S. in order to help the
19 U.S. economy by making U.S. companies more
20 competitive. If that's the case, then that's a
21 connection back to the U.S. economy. It almost
22 seems to be the case that people argue that we

1 have to restrict the extraterritoriality on the
2 one hand because you want to help U.S.
3 competitiveness which will help the U.S. economy
4 because those profits will flow back to the U.S.
5 But on the other hand, if we limit it, those risks
6 will not affect the U.S. economy because the
7 losses will not flow back to the U.S., that we're
8 going to sort of have our cake and eat it too and
9 that seems to me to be a contradiction. If you
10 want to make the argument that the profits are
11 going to come back to the U.S. economy, you should
12 have to be very specific about how those risks
13 won't come back to the U.S. economy as well.

14 MS. MESA: Thank you. Bill?

15 MR. MANSFIELD: It's a good question. I
16 think the answer has to be you're in, and what
17 does that mean? I think with regard to that
18 particular transaction, all the transactional
19 requirements with that which is reporting,
20 clearing, et cetera. Then it gets a little bit
21 more difficult when you think of other elements
22 within the rules and regs which are margin. I

1 think it's possible to be in on margin. It gets
2 even more complex when we think about capital so
3 with that particular transaction I need to hold
4 this amount of capital because this is where this
5 jurisdictional rule applies for this particular
6 transaction. That I think gets more problematic
7 because the whole concept of netting and the
8 global transactions that I'd have with the
9 counterparty. So largely you have to be in. I do
10 think that it does get back to a question that I
11 think we'll discuss hopefully sometime this
12 morning, on the affiliate transactions because
13 then I think about you're in but then I think
14 about how I've managed my book and market risk and
15 being able to transact with affiliates is
16 important to have those out in order to be in with
17 regard to transactions with U.S. clients.

18 MS. MESA: Dennis?

19 MR. KLEJNA: I want to make one point
20 about the statutory language, have a
21 direct-and-significant connection with activities
22 in or affect on commerce of the United States. It

1 says the commerce of the United States. It
2 doesn't say commerce in the United States.
3 Commerce of the United States is a pretty profound
4 thing, it seems to me. You can affect commerce by
5 picking up the phone from some place and having a
6 baseball mitt delivered to where you are, but to
7 affect the commerce of the United States, in a
8 direct-and-significant way, is a pretty high bar,
9 I would think.

10 MS. MESA: Suparna?

11 MS. VEDBRAT: I think it's also
12 important to understand what touch points in the
13 transaction are the entities involved would bring
14 you into the purview of Dodd-Frank. There are
15 some less obvious than just the counterparty
16 themselves or the client such as if you have some
17 operational efficiencies in your process where you
18 may handle all your confirms within the U.S. or
19 your collateral management may be U.S. based or
20 U.S. dollar denominated. Things like that. Would
21 that include you if you are dealing with a foreign
22 entity from a trading perspective and the client

1 is also domiciled outside the U.S.?

2 MS. MESA: Thank you. Ethiopis and then
3 I'm going to jump in.

4 MR. TAFARA: Thanks, Jackie. I wanted
5 to get back to something Dennis said earlier and I
6 think he's right in that I would say it's a pretty
7 significant achievement to get the G-20
8 jurisdictions to agree on trading, trade reporting
9 and dealing and dealer regulation. Of course they
10 agreed at a relatively high level and the devil
11 will be in the details, and until we've seen how
12 various jurisdictions give effect to those
13 principles, it's hard to say what the level of
14 comparability really will be and depending on the
15 level of comparability we may be able to get to
16 reliance or not. But as a complement to that, I
17 wanted to probe something David Kelly said earlier
18 or I think you said in that you were saying the
19 timing issue which is of concern here as I hear it
20 is of lesser consequence if the scoping is right
21 or the scoping of our rules, or are you saying
22 that even if we scope them correctly that timing

1 remains of consequence and of concern in light of
2 competitive concerns you may have or competitive
3 issues that arise?

4 MR. KELLY: It remains a concern but I
5 think that with a narrower extraterritorial scope
6 at least initially for your rules, it makes our
7 implementation jobs and our compliance programs
8 easier to develop if we know what we're doing.
9 There is clearly still potential for conflicts of
10 regulation between the United States and other
11 jurisdictions. We have some of that today. This
12 will surely give us 100 new problems to solve and
13 I'm sure we'll be working with you to try to do
14 that. But I think as a practical matter our
15 implementation time schedule is probably not going
16 to be the same as certainly the slower people in
17 the rest of the world.

18 MS. MESA: John?

19 MR. NICHOLAS: In answer to Ethiopis's
20 question, I think timing is less of a concern if
21 you do get the scope right, in particular thinking
22 about the potential issue of retaliation. I think

1 if we are overreaching or over inclusive we invite
2 that from European and Asian regulators. Just to
3 throw out an example, requiring a non-U.S.
4 clearinghouse to register with the agency as a DCO
5 for example or to require every clearing member of
6 a non-U.S. clearinghouse to register as an FCM, we
7 need to think very hard about that I think and I
8 understand there are issues with that on the
9 regulatory side absolutely that need to be worked
10 out. But again I think if we get the scope right,
11 I think timing is less of an issue.

12 MS. MESA: Tom?

13 MR. RIGGS: On your point, Ethiopis, I
14 generally agree with your statement. I think with
15 respect to, let's assume the rules are just
16 applying to U.S. people for example, I think
17 within that scope we still have to be focused on
18 what you guys obviously have been doing a lot of,
19 phase-in and sequencing. So how we sequence the
20 implementation of the rules and how they're
21 phased-in will have a big impact on how much we
22 can get one and how quickly. Because some things

1 arguably go before others in the implementation
2 timeline thing, but as a general matter I agree
3 with your scoping point.

4 MS. MESA: The last comment here.
5 Wally?

6 MR. TURBEVILLE: Quickly, again U.S.
7 persons, that is the task ahead of us. But in
8 terms of scope, keeping in mind that the U.S.
9 regulatory scheme is an articulation of what the
10 legal and business communities -- how the border
11 has been drawn between unacceptably risky behavior
12 and less risky behavior so that the competition
13 issue is by definition talking about engaging in
14 riskier behavior that the culture has sort of
15 suggested is the proper behavior to engage in. I
16 know it's not as simple as that, but we should
17 keep in mind that -- and I understand folks just
18 want to do business and make money, I got it --
19 but we should keep in mind in saying that's
20 problematic to me because I can't compete in that
21 kind of activity, that that is specifically the
22 kind of activity that the culture has said is too

1 risky to do.

2 MS. MESA: When I opened this panel I
3 talked about that we would address clearing,
4 reporting and trading, those issues that apply to
5 all persons and we've danced around whether there
6 are true conflicts or whether it's mainly overlap
7 that we see developing, and understanding that the
8 rest of the world doesn't have a solidified
9 position on anything yet really, but we have seen
10 Europe emerge with proposals and Japan. I want to
11 ask the panelists if they see any true conflicts
12 emerging regarding clearing, trading and
13 reporting. Are there real conflicts or might we
14 see emerging overlap and duplication? Luke?

15 MR. ZUBROD: One significant conflict
16 would result if the scope of the end user
17 exemption in one regulatory jurisdiction is
18 different from that in another. And whereas the
19 scope is firmly set here in the U.S., it remains
20 fluid abroad. One area where there is current
21 disharmony or is trending to be current disharmony
22 is with respect to the real estate sector in terms

1 of how Dodd-Frank treats that sector and how EMIR
2 treats that sector in European proposals. Real
3 estate is fundamentally nonfinancial in nature and
4 real estate companies use derivatives to hedge
5 commercial risk, but it can often be owned by
6 entities that are financial in nature. Dodd-Frank
7 took a nuanced approach in assessing whether or
8 not real estate entities were financial or
9 nonfinancial using a two-pronged test considering
10 both the legal structure and the underlying
11 business activity. EMIR is currently drafted such
12 that it focuses exclusively on legal structure and
13 consequently many real estate companies in Europe
14 and American companies operating in Europe could
15 be subject to a different availability with
16 respect to the end user exemption. So we would
17 encourage, to the extent possible, that U.S.
18 authorities work with their foreign counterparts
19 to ensure that for the benefit of competitiveness
20 any disharmonies between the U.S. and foreign
21 approaches are resolved with respect to the end
22 user exemption.

1 MS. MESA: Sticking to true conflicts,
2 Suparna and then Tom.

3 MS. VEDBRAT: On the clearing front
4 there is a difference emerging currently on the
5 collateral protection for clients in the U.S. We
6 have the omnibus structure and the CFTC has put
7 forward an alternative approach. In Europe you
8 see more of its aggregated model so that's one of
9 the areas where there is a difference. Related
10 with reporting, I'm not sure if this would be a
11 conflict or duplicative, but a U.S. entity account
12 that's a non-MSP were to trade with a foreign swap
13 dealer, then the reporting requirements falling on
14 the U.S.-domiciled entity which could be a little
15 bit problematic because it's just a small set of
16 transactions so we would like to see maybe the
17 reporting to reside with the swap dealer even if
18 it is a foreign registered swap dealer.

19 MR. RIGGS: I would note that there is a
20 lot of uncertainty still with European rules for
21 example, so people are projecting out what they
22 perceive what will be real conflicts. For

1 example, if there a European margin rule that has
2 a similar European-centric approach to the U.S.
3 approach on collecting dollar margin or treasuries
4 and the Europeans say you have to collect
5 collateral-denominated euros, that would be a
6 clear conflict if you're a U.S.-registered swap
7 dealer. Also for a European client trading with a
8 European entity that's a registered swap dealer,
9 if they trade a 5-year interest rate swap that's
10 mandatorily cleared here and then Europe also
11 requires clearing of that same transaction, I
12 think people are wondering how that's going to
13 work.

14 MS. MESA: Bill?

15 MR. MANSFIELD: I agree with the concept
16 that Luke mentioned in that it's important to
17 identify scope and then once we can identify scope
18 then we can understand what the conflicts are. I
19 think that the conflicts that were mentioned are
20 going to be the conflicts within the regulations
21 that will develop. I also want us to put
22 ourselves in the shoes of the European regulators

1 and their thinking of this as well. If they take
2 a broad interpretation of scope that is beyond
3 their borders let's call it, we're going to run
4 into similar conflicting rules and regs with
5 regard to transactions here with U.S. customers.
6 Scope is an important one and I think if we can
7 clearly define the scope I think we can eliminate
8 a lot of the conflicts that may exist.

9 MS. MESA: Bob?

10 MR. REILLY: In terms of conflicts, I
11 also think requirements for exchange trading is an
12 area where we could have some discontinuities, the
13 role of brokers bringing counterparties together
14 and I might point out that the definition of hedge
15 and differences in how hedging might be defined
16 would have major implications both in the area of
17 position limits and also the application of the
18 end user exemption.

19 MS. MESA: Thank you. Dennis?

20 MR. KLEJNA: I wanted to make the
21 observation that in the call for clarity which is
22 hard to argue with, the concern would be that

1 that's great as long as you get the clarity you
2 want because you may get a lot of clarity and I
3 don't know where that takes me. Going through the
4 list of differences that have already been
5 identified that people have pointed to, you get
6 into the weeds on this stuff. This is pretty
7 serious stuff and pretty serious differences as to
8 how you're going to reach harmony on these kinds
9 of things. No one envies the job that you have.
10 I certainly don't. But I think that that really
11 drives toward a more conceptual approach and a
12 communicative way of dealing with this with other
13 regulators. Maybe that gets you nowhere because
14 people are definitely going to have to make a
15 decision on where they're going to clear that
16 5-year interest rate swap. Something like that
17 somebody is going to have to decide what you do
18 because you can't violate one law by complying
19 with the other. I don't know what you're going to
20 do about that other than have more meetings with
21 your colleagues. I guess I'll stop there.

22 MS. MESA: Thank you.

1 MR. BUSSEY: I wanted to come back to
2 U.S. person to focus on it from the perspective of
3 the intermediary being the U.S. person. For
4 example, UBS's New York desk of Goldman's New York
5 operations intermediating a transaction between
6 its affiliates or its home bank and a Canadian
7 counterparty where the two counterparties to the
8 transaction are not U.S. but the intermediary is a
9 U.S. person. First, does that actually happen in
10 the real world right now? Second, if it does, how
11 should these three requirements, the reporting,
12 the trading requirements and the clearing
13 requirement apply when the only U.S. person is the
14 intermediary and not a counterparty to the
15 transaction?

16 MS. MESA: Suparna, did you have a
17 comment?

18 MS. VEDBRAT: Brian, I wanted to add to
19 that that the intermediary could also be the asset
20 manager.

21 MR. BUSSEY: You mean where the manager
22 is U.S. based but the account is actually a

1 foreign owned account?

2 MS. VEDBRAT: Yes, exactly, and also the
3 counterparty that you trade with is a foreign
4 counterparty.

5 MR. BUSSEY: Right.

6 MR. KLEJNA: The answer is, yes, it's
7 real. It probably happens every day at least at
8 Tom's firms and mine so that Blackrock in New York
9 calls my trading desk in Stamford and trades a
10 10-year interest rate swap for a Brazilian
11 counterparty for a Brazilian client whose money is
12 managed by Blackrock.

13 MR. BUSSEY: And you're setting it up
14 with somebody overseas as well with your home
15 bank, for example.

16 MR. KLEJNA: UBS AG's London branch
17 trades with a Brazil company.

18 MR. BUSSEY: So how should the rules
19 apply? You answered the easy question and not the
20 hard one.

21 MR. KLEJNA: I'll start fairly simply,
22 and I don't know the answers to all of these

1 questions, I just know that I don't want there to
2 be a different answer to the question or I don't
3 want to be required to clear in the trade in two
4 places. I suspect given the involvement of a
5 European entity and a U.S. entity in the short-run
6 we will probably have duplicative transaction
7 reporting because both of you will want
8 transaction reports. I'd like hopefully between
9 you and Europe and the rest of the world you'd get
10 over that at some point and we can report it once.
11 At the very least it would be nice to be able to
12 report one set of information and not have to
13 report three or four different sets. In terms of
14 clearing, if it's a clearable product I suspect
15 Blackrock will want to clear it, and if it can
16 clear in the U.S. and Europe, I think actually
17 we'd prefer that the choice be directed by the
18 client. I think it will ultimately be the end
19 user at least on the institutional side who will
20 be driving where trades get cleared.

21 MS. MESA: Ananda?

22 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: So if we took the

1 approach that the requirements apply to the people
2 responsible as opposed to people who may have --
3 I'll pick Suparna's company for example. I
4 suspect right now that Blackrock is not a
5 counterparty to the swaps. It's your client
6 because the client is financially responsible. So
7 in the example we just gave let's say we said the
8 large Brazilian company is the counterparty and
9 UBS AG is the counterparty and let's assume UBS AG
10 registers because the branch is not a legal person
11 so it's you go back. Nobody has been able to
12 convince me that a branch is a legal person.

13 MS. MESA: Next panel.

14 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Next panel. Then
15 the question is, is the Brazilian company subject
16 to Dodd-Frank, that's the question, as opposed to
17 -- maybe I'm wrong. Maybe people are saying it
18 should be Blackrock that's -- because Blackrock is
19 exercising a certain amount of discretion or
20 whatever it is that they have to register. I
21 don't know. I know what your answer is but I want
22 to know other people's answers.

1 MS. MESA: Luke?

2 MR. ZUBROD: I'll add to the complexity
3 of this question by noting that the issue also
4 arises with end users who have centralized
5 treasury groups that execute for the ultimate
6 benefit of affiliates and we would certainly
7 welcome clarity on how interaffiliate transactions
8 might be handled. In this case end users
9 typically view the intercompany, the
10 interaffiliate transactions that they execute as
11 mechanisms that simply transfer risk within a
12 corporate group so would hope for or look for any
13 requirements that not apply to those
14 interaffiliate transactions except perhaps for
15 reporting because those don't have a material
16 bearing on systemic risk concerns.

17 MS. MESA: Tom?

18 MR. RIGGS: Obviously it's a hard
19 question. One obvious answer may be that the
20 Brazilian client is not a U.S. person and the
21 rules shouldn't apply to them. But obviously one
22 of the concerns we have, or one of the concerns I

1 have, is a lot of the focus on international
2 issues is focused on Europe and there's a big
3 world of clients out there in Asia, South and
4 Latin America and Canada where clearly the
5 regulatory regimes are even further behind where
6 Europe is. How do we make sure that the
7 regulatory issues are dealt with but don't
8 wholesale those markets to other people away from
9 U.S. firms? Because, the Brazilian client will
10 say I'm not going to follow the U.S. margin rules
11 when I can trade with an Asian bank and not have
12 to. I think this issue of where the globe is, is
13 it different places, is actually a big issue
14 because we're so focused on Europe versus the
15 United States.

16 But I also think another issue we see
17 quite frequently, is that the risk is moved into
18 the United States because a client outside the
19 United States wants to trade an S&P 500 swap, so a
20 non-U.S. entity may book the trade but the risk
21 may get moved internally to a U.S. swap dealer
22 which gets to the whole question of whether

1 intercompany trading subjects you to registration,
2 margin, SEF, clearing and all those kinds of
3 things which is a big issue because if you can't
4 move the risk to the place where you have the
5 expertise, that makes everything more expensive
6 and makes you less competitive as well.

7 MS. MESA: Wally?

8 MR. TURBEVILLE: I think we've just seen
9 the discussion that suggests that all of these
10 things should be within the jurisdiction of
11 Dodd-Frank but might be treated differently rather
12 than making some giant decision in scope saying
13 that categorically the scope of Dodd-Frank is
14 limited more narrowly than what's completely
15 suggested by the statute itself. So a transaction
16 that's really between the Brazilian and Swiss
17 entities might have a different result and even
18 though it comes through the United States it's
19 clearly activity inside the United States, part of
20 that activity is, and that might have a different
21 result than an activity where an end user or
22 anyone else actually through affiliate swaps put

1 the risk in a combined comprehensive book as part
2 of one business notwithstanding the fact that
3 maybe it originated with a swap by a subsidiary,
4 but it's really part of the whole business. Say
5 it's in the same book, it's guaranteed by the
6 parent and all that, that's a duck. I think the
7 gist of it all is that probably all of these are
8 within the scope of Dodd-Frank but might have
9 different outcomes from a regulatory standpoint
10 because of policy considerations.

11 MR. BUSSEY: Can you drill down, Tom or
12 Wally? If the rules do apply to the New York
13 desk, why isn't the result Goldman and UBS move to
14 Toronto, the desk that does that activity, so that
15 they can intermeditate the UBS AG London branch and
16 the Brazilian account, or Blackrock moves from
17 Connecticut or wherever you're located up to
18 Toronto so that you don't have this type of
19 transaction subject to Dodd-Frank?

20 MR. TURBEVILLE: Let me say, yes, I
21 understand what you're saying, and if the scoping
22 is done so that you allow people to use

1 subsidiaries, to move a subsidiary up to Toronto,
2 yes, you make it really easy for them to do so.
3 However, I don't know how you get around the fact
4 that you've got a concept of territoriality where
5 there's the United States, Canada, Europe or
6 Japan, and you're trying to regulate a business
7 which by definition defines the concept of
8 territoriality? If we give in to that we end up
9 with mathematically, and I'm not mathematician,
10 I'm a lawyer for crying out loud, but I think
11 mathematically you end up with virtual
12 lawlessness. I think you eventually get to the
13 lowest, lowest denominator so soon you're worried
14 about people going off to, I don't want to offend
15 anybody, some country in the Pacific, a tiny
16 island in the Pacific. I think, yes, you're
17 right, but that calls for a broader scoping
18 definition with pragmatic rules so that you don't
19 make it easy for people to move across the border
20 to Toronto or to Pago Pago.

21 MR. TAFARA: Tom raises an interesting
22 point with regard to this coordination in terms of

1 timing as between us and some other regions other
2 than Europe. But I think the example you raise
3 leads to a question for Suparna which is, is that
4 the choice that you would make or is that the
5 choice that your client would make? In other
6 words, if the choice is between working with
7 Goldman Sachs in New York or dealing with some
8 intermediary in Hong Kong that's unregulated, are
9 there pressures that actually push you toward
10 Goldman Sachs as opposed to, and this is probably
11 a policy question, but what is the choice you
12 would make in that situation?

13 MS. VEDBRAT: I think that you would
14 need to consider where you get competitive pricing
15 and also overall strong counterparties for your
16 clients so I think it would depend who's on the
17 other. If you have an equally strong counterparty
18 that's in Hong Kong and you're able to get good
19 liquidity and pricing available there, you're
20 going to see a gravitation of choice moving
21 overseas.

22 MS. MESA: John?

1 MR. NICHOLAS: Quickly, I think to take
2 Brian's example, it seems to me that if you have a
3 U.S.-based intermediary and two non-U.S. customers
4 on either side, that the U.S.-based intermediary
5 is going to have some registration requirement, be
6 it FCM or a BD, in which case it itself should be
7 subject to all of the relevant Dodd-Frank rules.
8 The transactions on either side I would think
9 would be also subject to the Dodd-Frank rules as
10 well. I'm not sure how you can get around that or
11 would want to get around that, frankly.

12 To Ethiopis's point, I think it's a good
13 point which is, we tend to be thinking about
14 regulation in a negative connotation for business,
15 but having worked with many of our customers, I
16 know that being able to conduct business in a
17 robust regulatory framework is generally
18 considered a pretty good thing.

19 MS. MESA: That sounds like a great note
20 to end on, people choose robust regulation. Why
21 don't we conclude Panel 1. We have a 15-minute
22 break before Panel 2. We're going to get to do a

1 deeper dive into the same issues regarding
2 entities. Thank you, and thanks to all of our
3 Panel 1 participants.

4 (Recess)

5 MS. MESA: Let's prepare to get started.
6 So if you could grab a seat. So, I want to
7 welcome our second panel for the day. I'm going
8 to do what we did with the first panel, which is
9 could we just go around and do a self-introduction
10 of your name and who you're with, and this time
11 let's start with -- actually, we know Bob but
12 we'll start with Bob again.

13 Bob?

14 MR. REILLY: Bob Reilly from Shell
15 Trading.

16 MR. McCARTHY: John McCarthy from GETCO.

17 MS. LEE: Sarah Lee from Bank of
18 America.

19 MS. KARNA: Angie Karna from Nomura.

20 MR. ALLEN: Chris Allen from Barclays.

21 MR. O'CONNOR: Hi, Steve O'Connor from
22 Morgan Stanley.

1 MR. STANLEY: Marcus Stanley from
2 Americans for Financial Reform.

3 MR. TURBEVILLE: Wally Turbeville,
4 Better Markets.

5 MR. RIFFAUD: Marcelo Riffaud from
6 Deutsche Bank.

7 MS. MESA: Okay, I'm going to ask Dan
8 Berkovitz, our General Counsel, to ask the first
9 question and get started.

10 MR. BERKOVITZ: Thank you, Jackie, and
11 welcome to our second panelists.

12 I'd like to start off with a question
13 that's somewhat a follow-up from much of what was
14 discussed on the first panel, but perhaps we can
15 get into it with a little more specificity on this
16 panel.

17 The question would be specifically which
18 activities should trigger -- which activities
19 outside the United States should trigger a
20 registration requirement for a swap dealer? Would
21 it be only the activities dealing with U.S.
22 persons within the United States, or would it also

1 potentially be activities with U.S. persons
2 outside the United States?

3 And then the second question would be
4 once registered, which Dodd-Frank provisions
5 should apply? Should it be transactional
6 requirements that would apply to specific
7 transactions or, as you're aware, Dodd-Frank for
8 swap dealers, major swap participants, not only
9 has transactional requirements but has a number of
10 entity-wide requirements. Those would be capital
11 requirements; those could be business conduct
12 standards, internal business conduct standards, as
13 well as external business conduct standards. And,
14 for example, the external business conduct
15 standards would be how you deal with certain
16 counterparties; internal business conduct
17 standards would be things like chief compliance
18 officer, risk management procedures, documentation
19 procedures. If you're a U.S. swap dealer solely
20 dealing within the U.S. or MSP and you become
21 designated, all those requirements apply to all
22 your transactions. But if you are a swap dealer

1 outside the United States, who becomes a swap
2 dealer by virtue of your dealings with U.S.
3 persons, which of these transaction requirements
4 should apply? Which of the entity-wide
5 requirements apply?

6 So, the first question would be the
7 threshold question -- which activities count
8 towards the determination of whether an entity
9 outside the United States is a swap dealer? And
10 then the second question would be once the
11 threshold is triggered and you become a swap
12 dealer or MSP, which of the Dodd-Frank
13 requirements would apply?

14 MR. TAFARA: Right. Why don't we start
15 with Marcelo, and then we'll turn to Angie.

16 MR. RIFFAUD: Thank you very much. I
17 think the answer to the first question -- which
18 activities would make you a swap dealer -- it's in
19 the statute, and the prior panel, the entire
20 discussion about whether you're facing a U.S.
21 person, however defined or involved in the U.S.
22 transaction, however defined, that would be what

1 should give rise to whether you're a swap dealer
2 subject to registration.

3 On the question of what rules would
4 apply at that point, I think the trivial answer is
5 all of them, and -- but then when would you apply
6 those? You would apply the entity-wide rules by
7 definition, apply to the entire entity at all
8 times. So, to the extent your concern about
9 capital, it's entity-wide and you're measuring it
10 at all times.

11 When you're talking about the
12 transaction-based rules, that is where a swap
13 dealer should need to be compliant only when
14 facing U.S. persons on U.S. transactions. So, a
15 bank that has activity both with U.S. and non-U.S.
16 persons, the transaction-based rules should attach
17 only to the former category. That would be
18 another proposal. But that non-U.S. activity does
19 impact the entity-wide activity, and so that's why
20 you're measuring that at the entity, all the other
21 activity.

22 MR. TAFARA: Angie.

1 MS. KARNA: Further, I agree with what
2 Marcelo said about activities with U.S. persons.
3 I would also take us back to the first panel. We
4 think the definition of "U.S. persons" really
5 should stem from existing law, and so, for
6 example, one of the points that had been made
7 earlier related to offshore affiliates or offshore
8 branches of U.S. institutions. Under existing
9 law, under securities laws, if Nomura's foreign
10 dealer provides a risk management solution to a
11 Japanese subsidiary of a U.S. company or provides
12 a risk management solution to a U.S. investment
13 manager, who is managing Japanese risk for a
14 foreign client, then we don't believe that the
15 foreign dealer needs to register in the United
16 States of America. We believe that that's
17 offshore activity.

18 MR. TAFARA: Chris?

19 MR. ALLEN: Thank you. I agree with
20 that. I think it does stem from the definition of
21 U.S. person, and I agree with Angie's comments in
22 terms of how one might look at that question by

1 reference to existing law, particularly, for
2 example, Reg S.

3 I think what -- going to the second
4 question, though -- as to what it might be that
5 then kicks in under Dodd-Frank when one is on the
6 face of it when the scope of the regime. It
7 strikes me that quite usefully the distinction is
8 much (inaudible) between entity-style regulation
9 and transactions specific to that basis of
10 regulation is an important one. On the face of
11 it, you might obviously have the notion if you're
12 looking at capital and prudential regulation,
13 clearly that only makes real sense when
14 contemplated at an entity level.

15 At the same time, I think, on that
16 score, it's important to recognize the importance
17 of potentially deferring to home state regulators.
18 In circumstances where those home state regulators
19 have a comprehensive and globally recognized
20 standard of regulation of, for example, capital or
21 other aspects of prudential regulation. And that,
22 obviously, would be a test that would have to be

1 satisfied on a jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction basis.

2 When it comes to the transaction level
3 regulation, and obviously aspects of conduct of
4 business that would fall within that, it strikes
5 me as most useful to apply or to require the
6 embassy's entity which is a registered swap dealer
7 -- apply those conducts of business standards in
8 circumstances where it is dealing with a U.S.
9 person. So, for example, it strikes me as
10 entirely sensible that the U.K. -- and see which
11 is a registered as a swap dealer but which has
12 entered into transactions with a U.S investor. It
13 should be required to apply U.S. conducts of
14 business standards relationship. However, the
15 London entity of the U.K. firm entering into
16 transactions with an Italian client, for example
17 -- it strikes me that the most appropriate
18 conducts of business standards to apply there
19 would be those that apply innocently or
20 potentially in the United Kingdom but certainly
21 easily.

22 MS. LEE: I don't think I've actually

1 got much to add, because you've thought of
2 everything that I was going to say. So, I mean, I
3 agree completely with Chris and Angie and Marcelo,
4 particularly as well in terms of the registration
5 requirement really applying when you're dealing
6 with entities domiciled in the U.S., U.S. persons.
7 And in terms of when the entity registers and how
8 those requirements apply, I agree whole heartedly
9 with Chris, that I think the distinction needs to
10 be made between entity-level requirements, and
11 transaction-level requirements, and in relation to
12 the entity-level requirements I do think some
13 thought should certainly be given to comparable
14 regulation of those entities in those foreign
15 jurisdictions that they could be relied on, and at
16 the transactional level, I think certainly
17 transactional-level requirements should be applied
18 around business contacts, clearing, reporting to
19 that entity's trading activities with U.S. persons
20 domiciled in the U.S., but not to the transaction
21 requirements of that entity with foreign persons
22 outside the U.S.

1 MR. TAFARA: Wally.

2 MR. TURBEVILLE: We slipped into
3 domiciled. Sorry. So, I think that it's clear
4 that if you defer to U.S. persons, that's an issue
5 that's not very Dodd-Frankish and has standards,
6 and from our perspective domiciled wouldn't be the
7 issue. But I'm also sort of struck by what
8 appears to be a thought that at any level kinds of
9 regulation, capital and others, that the sense is
10 that you would be a Dodd-Frank jurisdictional
11 entity but there would be some deference to other
12 entities, which I think is -- you know, the
13 standards are another issue, but that being an
14 approach recognizing there could be duplicative
15 regimes that might apply sounds like a sensible
16 one, too -- is to understand which particular
17 requirements are ones that are absolutely required
18 by the U.S. regulatory regime and others for which
19 some sort of deference might be provided.

20 MR. TAFARA: Brian, did you want to
21 probe with regard to that a little bit?

22 MR. BUSSEY: Yeah, so to sum up the

1 answers, if it's -- regardless of whether the
2 dealer is domiciled in the U.S. or overseas, it
3 turns on whether the counterparty is a U.S.
4 person. Is that what I'm hearing from the
5 panelists? And if that's the case what side of
6 the line -- so that you're taught making a
7 distinction between entity level and transaction
8 level, which side of the line does margin fall on
9 in that divide?

10 MR. TAFARA: Robert, I don't know
11 whether that was something you planned on
12 addressing. Why I don't let you pick up and then
13 maybe turn to Stephen, who I think is trying to be
14 responsive to Brian, so go ahead, Robert Reilly.

15 MR. REILLY: Well, first -- just going
16 back to the original question, I just want to
17 emphasize the transactions between affiliates
18 should not be covered by Dodd-Frank whether in the
19 U.S. or if they're between affiliates in the U.S.
20 and another country. Other than that, I think
21 that only entities that have a direct and
22 significant connection with U.S. commerce ought to

1 be covered and I think "significant" means
2 something. It doesn't mean a hypothetical
3 connection. It means something that's very direct
4 and very tangible. So, I think some of the things
5 you would look at in that regard are well, gee,
6 does the company have a U.S. presence; is it
7 trading in U.S. markets with non-affiliates; and
8 what is its volume of bilateral trading in
9 commodities with U.S. underliers?

10 MR. TAFARA: Stephen, did you want to
11 tell Brian on which side of the line you would
12 place margin?

13 MR. O'CONNOR: Yes. But before that, I
14 think it's worth stating that we would all like
15 all the rules globally to change on the same day
16 and to be the same rules in each jurisdiction with
17 mutual recognition of authority between regulators
18 of a certain standing and mutual recognition of
19 infrastructure such as CCPs and dates of
20 repositories. And when you -- and clearly we're
21 not in that world, so that's where
22 extraterritoriality comes in, and I think the U.S.

1 going first is fine, but the extraterritorial
2 components of that are very important. And then
3 the most important thing is to reserve a level
4 playing field within a market. So, U.S. clients,
5 when trading with U.S. or European banks, should
6 be the same rules applying to both banks, and
7 within Europe I think U.S. banks and European
8 banks have to be treated the same as well.

9 So, specifically answering Brian's
10 question, I agree with the comments made earlier
11 that the transactional-level rules should, with
12 regard to European entities, apply only to
13 transactions with U.S. counterparties. And to the
14 extent that European operations, for instance, of
15 U.S. banks, trade with European clients, they
16 should not be subject to the Dodd-Frank
17 transactional rules, including the margin rules,
18 because if they did then you would not have a
19 level playing field in Europe. European clients
20 would be incented to not trade with those European
21 operations of U.S. banks, which leads to reduced
22 liquidity in those markets, reduced competition.

1 Other consequences would be jobs and tax impacts
2 in the U.S. U.S. banks would be hampered in their
3 ability to nudge a capital formation, including in
4 the U.S., because the global reach is important to
5 provide those services even to U.S. clients. It's
6 either geographical shift of liquidity, mentioned
7 earlier, from the U.S. into Europe, including for
8 U.S. products; and U.S. regulators would have less
9 visibility into global markets as product move
10 offshore, including into U.S. product, which
11 itself might move more offshore. So, I think the
12 consequences of having an unlevel playing field in
13 Europe -- was the example I gave -- or in the U.S.
14 would have profound impacts on markets.

15 MR. TAFARA: Okay, Marcus, Wally, then
16 Ananda, and then Marcelo.

17 MR. STANLEY: Yeah, I'm not sure we want
18 to get completely hung up on this transaction
19 entity level distinction. I mean, it's, to a
20 degree, a real distinction, but our focus ought to
21 be on the statutory goals of the Act, and to me it
22 seems like margin, whichever side of the line it

1 falls on -- it falls on the side of the line where
2 you want to do it -- because fundamentally the Act
3 is meant to avoid a situation where the U.S.
4 market is exposed to the risk created by the
5 failure of a major derivatives dealer, and we
6 know, because this entity has registered as a
7 swaps dealer under Dodd-Frank that it's doing
8 activities that have a direct and significant
9 connection to the U.S. economy, and presumably its
10 failure would expose the U.S. economy to some
11 negative fallout as well. And margin -- here, you
12 know, the line between margin and capital --
13 they're very interrelated to me, because they're
14 both a means of sort of making sure that you have
15 the funds available to protect yourself in case
16 you end up very far out of the money on a
17 derivatives transaction. And presumably,
18 actually, if you weren't taking margin, your
19 capital requirements should actually be higher.
20 So, I think it makes a lot of sense for the margin
21 requirements to be, in effect, for anybody who
22 registers as a swaps dealer under Dodd-Frank.

1 And in response to Stephen's point that
2 this would -- that a loss of business in Europe
3 for U.S. subsidiaries would result in a hampered
4 ability to provide capital to firms in the U.S.,
5 this goes back to something I said in the first
6 panel, that to me this just demonstrates what
7 global entities these are, that profits and losses
8 in subsidiaries can affect the flow of capital
9 into the U.S. And I'd really want to see if the
10 profits are affecting the flow of capital into the
11 U.S.; I'd really want to see some very hard-core
12 proof that the losses won't flow into the U.S. as
13 well.

14 MR. TURBEVILLE: Margin -- the
15 philosophy behind the proposed regulations that
16 are out there is that margin is taken by swap
17 dealers to protect them from harm along the lines
18 of systemic risk issues and, like Marcus was
19 saying, it's aligned with capital, so that would
20 be an entity purpose. However, if you read our
21 comment letters, we think there are other reasons
22 for margin to be there. They just don't happen to

1 appear in the proposed regulations yet. So, we're
2 hopeful that in the final they do. But at least
3 there's an entity-level purpose behind the
4 regulations; ergo, margin is at least entity
5 based.

6 MR. TAFARA: Ananda?

7 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: I want to pick up at
8 the point that Stephen made, which is -- and I see
9 the attraction of treating people the same, right,
10 irrespective of where you're located. In other
11 words, Morgan Stanley, you should be treated the
12 same as Barclays; you're both swap dealers. And I
13 think the point you made was we should only
14 regulate you for your activities with other U.S.
15 persons on a transactional basis. I think that
16 was the point that was being made.

17 Now, the question is this, if we
18 accepted their proposition, basically what we're
19 saying is whatever Morgan Stanley does outside the
20 United States does not have a direct and
21 significant connection with activities in the
22 United States, because that would have to be it,

1 because -- and so I'm trying to reconcile the
2 approach you're suggesting with our duty to
3 enforce the statute.

4 MR. O'CONNOR: Right. And I understand
5 the struggle you face. But also the G-20 talks
6 are having a level playing field and not creating
7 situations of regulatory arbitrage, so I think to
8 some degree there is a balance needed here.

9 And the point made about financial
10 institutions being global entities is quite true,
11 so the point I made at the outset was that ideally
12 we'd want to have the same rules in all
13 jurisdictions, and I think energy should be spent
14 on trying to reconcile the rule set and the timing
15 between Europe and the U.S. primarily but other
16 jurisdictions as well, and that's the solution to
17 regulating global entities rather than going first
18 -- and as I said earlier, going first is a good
19 thing, and it shows that the U.S. is taking a
20 lead, but going first and then hampering the
21 businesses of the U.S. banks seems to be -- will
22 be harmful and is the opposite protectionism

1 basically.

2 MR. TAFARA: To follow up on what Ananda
3 has just said and to pick up on a couple of points
4 that Wally made earlier, we haven't responded to
5 the approach whereby you don't defer or there is
6 no deference with respect to the conduct rules,
7 one, because there is a timing issue -- in other
8 words, what are we deferring to? Two, why not
9 have complementary requirements whereby the
10 requirements are more or less the same at least in
11 terms of outcomes without necessarily having to
12 defer to a home regulator or have the entity level
13 -- I think that's what was being suggested. I
14 think it's probably worthwhile to try and respond
15 to that point and as was raised by Wally.

16 So, I see a number of flags up. Chris.
17 Sarah I think was next, Angie, Wally, and then
18 Marcelo.

19 MR. ALLEN: I was just going to comment
20 that it strikes me that when we talk about
21 potential deference to home state regulation,
22 that's not in some way a suggestion that the

1 standard that should be applicable to that
2 institution should be in any way less, because I
3 think it is quite important that that approach be
4 underpinned by an acceptance by U.S. regulations.
5 But the overseas standard of regulation is
6 appropriate, comprehensive, and conforms to
7 requisite global standards in terms of the
8 integrity of that regulatory approach. And if
9 that is not the case in terms of the overseas
10 regulatory cultural approach, then that regulation
11 would not be in place on the capacity to defer.
12 It just wouldn't apply. So, I think there was a
13 safety mechanism, if you like, embedded within
14 that.

15 I'd also just to -- I agree with the
16 comment -- I can't remember who it was made it,
17 but there is obviously a very close nexus between
18 capital regulation and margining, in that of
19 course the less collateral and institution-sought
20 dealer holds on its booking relations to its
21 counterparty trading lines, so the amounts of
22 risk-rated asset and (inaudible) capital that it

1 has put behind that business increases
2 significantly. So, of course there is an
3 important connection between those two concepts.
4 It doesn't necessarily strike me, though, that
5 that takes us to the conclusion that one should
6 look at margin from an entity perspective, because
7 it strikes me fundamentally that it does fall
8 within a kind of conduct of business conceptual
9 type of rule and because not least of the
10 difficulty that derives from the fact that
11 different regulations around the world are also
12 looking at that same question in terms very much
13 of the conducts of business standards that should
14 apply to dealers and market participants in their
15 respective markets. If you take the European
16 example, which is the one I am closest to, and the
17 EMIR regulation, which provides for, among other
18 things, principle trade reporting and managed
19 claim rate (inaudible) derivatives. Of course,
20 one of the provisions in that regulation, which I
21 appreciate, is behind the U.S. In terms of timing
22 but has still relatively progressed. That

1 specifically contemplates margin requirements for
2 uncleared transactions. I think trying to apply
3 in Europe between transactions entered into why a
4 swap dealer registered UKMC and its Italian
5 client, for example. A margin requirement, which
6 was in any way different from the one which was
7 required to be applied by the U.K. and Italian
8 regulators to govern that relationship, I think,
9 could be highly problematic.

10 MR. TAFARA: Sarah.

11 MS. LEE: Yeah, I wanted to touch upon
12 margin requirements as well, in particular, I
13 mean, a lot of people have been talking a lot
14 about Europe, but lesser about Asia and where that
15 market is at the moment in terms of its margin
16 requirements. I mean, Asia is still what I call,
17 many Asian jurisdictions are still, in the very
18 early stages of derivatives development. So,
19 there you have the fully bank market practices
20 that we might see in the West. So, jurisdictions
21 like China, India, Taiwan currently don't have
22 market practice to call for margin in those

1 jurisdictions. So, I think one of the challenges
2 that we face is if we require a margin at the
3 entity level, it becomes difficult, then, for
4 entities that have registered in the U.S. to
5 operate in those jurisdictions, because local
6 banks will not be asking for margin. And so to
7 manage the risk of trading activity in those
8 jurisdictions where isn't margining, capital -- as
9 Chris was referring to -- can be used as a tool to
10 help manage the risk of those jurisdictions not
11 yet having the same sort of margining practices
12 that we see in the rest but then allowing global
13 institutions like ourselves to be able to operate
14 in those jurisdictions.

15 MR. TAFARA: Chris, was a two-handed
16 intervention? Did you want to follow up very
17 quickly on what Sarah just said?

18 MR. ALLEN: I agreed with what Sarah was
19 saying, but the point I wanted to make was the
20 potential consequence or conclusion if one pursued
21 the notion of margin -- as an example, applying at
22 the entity level -- which is touching on a point

1 which was raised in the first panel, which is the
2 potential fragmentation at the legal entity level
3 of the different participants in the markets in a
4 manner which could be unhelpful when it comes to a
5 host of issues, but not least for failure
6 margining taxation on capital. Because if it were
7 the case, that's the requirements complying with
8 Dodd-Frank margin rules for a European entity,
9 brought that entity into conflict with obligations
10 it might have under the European regulation regime
11 touching on the same issue. There may be an
12 inevitable consequence of that, which is that in
13 order to be able to continue with both European
14 and the U.S. businesses, the interesting question
15 has to subsidiarize its operations. And that
16 strikes me from a capital vetting in various
17 perspectives, essentially unhelpful. And also
18 query, why does it really take the systemic risk
19 debate further forward.

20 MR. TAFARA: Angie.

21 MS. KARNA: Yeah, I think Chris

22 mentioned one of the things I was quite focused on

1 as well. You had asked the question earlier,
2 Ethiopis, about what's the consequence of no
3 deference. For us at an entity level, the
4 consequence of no deference is the line of the
5 spectrum that was mentioned at the beginning of
6 today, which is isolation, and specifically
7 subsidiarization and having regionalized pools of
8 capital and a lack of liquidity for global end
9 users and global end clients who want to access
10 markets in different jurisdictions. So, we think
11 it's critical that there be deference at entity
12 levels, and for us capital is a primary example,
13 and we agree that margin and capital are linked
14 and raise challenging questions. But we also
15 agree that a level playing field is critical for
16 functioning markets globally and for U.S.
17 investors and end users of derivatives to be able
18 to access those markets globally.

19 MR. TAFARA: Angie, can I press just a
20 bit on that point --

21 MS. KARNA: Sure.

22 MR. TAFARA: -- to ask why deference if

1 the requirements are complementary and indeed may
2 be highly comparable? In other words, as long as
3 the standards are comparable, need there be
4 deference in terms of saying we're going to simply
5 leave it to you to oversee the entity, whereas you
6 could, if they were complementary requirements,
7 have a relationship whereby it is a coordinated,
8 collaborative effort on the part of the
9 regulators?

10 MS. KARNA: Capital, to me, is the
11 fundamental issue, and there are global capital
12 standards that all of the major global
13 institutions are applying based on their local
14 regulatory interpretations of those standards.
15 So, capital is assessed for an entity looking at
16 all of its risks, not just a piece of its risk.
17 And when I speak to risk managers at Nomura or
18 anywhere else, they tell me that they speak Greeks
19 not grids and that they look at capital and they
20 look at risk across all of their entities. So,
21 it's very critical for us to manage our risk and
22 manage along one set of rules, not slight

1 differences in rules between different
2 jurisdictions.

3 MR. TAFARA: I see a number of the
4 regulators have raised their flags, so maybe I'll
5 turn to them quickly and then turn to the other
6 side of the table.

7 So, I think, Jackie, you had your flag
8 up first, and then Dan.

9 MS. MESA: Just wanted to follow up on
10 something actually Sarah said, that I'm hearing
11 sort of two different lines here. One is that,
12 you know, in Europe we want you to defer on the
13 entity level regulations, and Sarah pointed out
14 the Asian situation where maybe they won't have
15 margin applied in the same way or margin at all as
16 it's developing OTC market. And so my question
17 really is, in that situation, are you saying that
18 we shouldn't defer, because there isn't something
19 to defer to? I mean, you were saying there's a
20 competition concern you have, but if we completely
21 leave that unregulated then we haven't done our
22 jobs, have we, in the systemic risk oversight?

1 MS. LEE: Yeah, I wasn't saying that you
2 should just stick in all that situation, but I
3 think there are other tools that you can use
4 instead of margin to manage the risk of that
5 trading activity, which is unmarginated, which is
6 capital and that you can hold more capital in
7 those jurisdictions where you don't feel the
8 regime is the same as the U.S. or the margining
9 requirements are the same, which still allows
10 participants to operate in those regimes by
11 following the local requirements for that trading
12 activity but also balances back with the capital
13 that's held against a perceived increased risk.

14 MR. TAFARA: Dan?

15 MR. BERKOVITZ: I'm intrigued by the
16 notion that it's simply a question of the capital
17 requirements entity and entity-wide capital
18 requirements. In Dodd-Frank, at least for the
19 U.S. swap dealers, the bank swap dealers are the
20 capital requirements, and that will be determined
21 by the prudential regulators. But then there's
22 also the other entity-wide business conduct

1 standards in terms of risk management
2 documentation, the other entity level. We call
3 them prudential regulations. I guess to take that
4 approach would be almost for us to say that those
5 are not of any significance in terms of any level
6 regulation or systemic risk reduction.

7 How do we -- how would we get beyond
8 that hurdle of basically saying these are not
9 necessary for prudential regulation of these or
10 entity-wide regulation?

11 MS. KARNA: And just because you're
12 looking at me, I think you think I said something
13 earlier that I didn't say. I think capital is the
14 quintessential entity-level requirement but not
15 the only entity-level requirement. For example,
16 our internal conduct standards, our chief
17 compliance officer standards, our walls, and our
18 barriers can only be assessed at an entity level
19 as opposed to at a transactional level, and so I
20 think that there's a host of issues and those are
21 other examples of what I would consider to be
22 appropriate prudential standards that, as Chris

1 mentioned earlier, I wouldn't expect you to defer
2 to all of those prudential standards without an
3 assessment that the particular regime has
4 appropriate and comparable standards to what you
5 would expect in the United States.

6 MR. TAFARA: Marcelo, you've been
7 waiting patiently.

8 MR. RIFFAUD: That's okay. Most of what
9 I was going to say has been said. Thank you,
10 Ethiopis.

11 Let me take your question, Dan,
12 consistent with what Angie just said. We think of
13 the entity-wide rules as we don't -- when we say
14 "deference," we're just -- we're not saying that
15 it's a complete delegation, right? We're saying
16 that you've made an assessment consistent with
17 what historically has been done in the banking
18 sector for cross-border banking supervision.
19 There's an assessment that there's comfort.
20 There's comparability with the home country
21 regime, right? And then so there should be some
22 comfort there to defer to the home country

1 regulator. The rules, though, that are
2 entity-wide -- some are more prudential than
3 others. Some go to capital, centralized risk
4 management, etc., but then there are some in
5 Dodd-Frank that are less prudential in nature but
6 are still entity-wide. So, CCO rules. Conflicts
7 of interest. Diligent supervision, right?
8 Monitoring of trade. Those are rules that the
9 deference there -- if you choose not to defer,
10 those are rules that when you promulgate them, you
11 should think seriously about adopting a flexible
12 approach that accommodates preexisting
13 organizational structures and approaches that we
14 have in our home countries that have been required
15 or that we have put in place to comply with our
16 own local regulation.

17 MR. TAFARA: Thank you. Wally.

18 MR. TURBEVILLE: Margin and capital are
19 related, but they're different. They're not
20 transferable. Margin is micro. It's about
21 transactions and correlations and offsetting, and
22 all that good stuff. Capital -- proper capital

1 should assume -- it should be set at the level
2 required, assuming that you actually margin like a
3 sane person. So, those are two different things.
4 However, they both, under the philosophy that's
5 being adopted by our hosts here, have to do with
6 entity level. For instance, the Asian
7 transaction, what the problem with it is -- you
8 allow a company to have a subsidiary in Asia who
9 could run up all kinds of exposure -- unmargined
10 exposure -- on transactions, which then blows back
11 on the U.S. entity, and the whole point of
12 margining as it was set up was to protect that
13 entity. So, in other words, that's -- so, what
14 you -- that's what the real issue is, is that
15 margin requirements were set up to protect
16 entities and allowing extraterritoriality issues
17 that aren't necessary, given the -- even
18 reasonable given the actual statute to come into
19 play, you allow that whole policy to be
20 undermined, right? So, margin and capital are two
21 different things, and we shouldn't ignore the fact
22 that a dealer in the U.S. is supposed to get

1 margin for its positions in order to protect it,
2 in order to protect the whole economy.

3 MR. TAFARA: We'll turn to Marcus, then
4 John, and then I think we've exhausted this series
5 of questions and we'll move onto the next and
6 Jackie will get us started.

7 So, Marcus?

8 MR. STANLEY: Well, Wally really said a
9 lot of what I wanted to say there on margin and
10 capital. They're related, but they're not the
11 same thing, and they have complementary strength.

12 And just seconding what Wally said, I'd
13 also point to the experience with risk-weighted
14 capital before the crisis when capital
15 requirements were arbitrated very significantly,
16 and it's much easier to arbitrage a set of capital
17 requirements for the entire entity where you can
18 have claims about hedges that are being made
19 across many, many different subsidiaries, where
20 there's a lot of complex processing, where you're
21 trying to put all of the entity's exposures into
22 one number, whereas with margin -- margin is

1 something that happens at the transaction level
2 but contributes to the health of the whole entity,
3 because you're forced to take some margin for each
4 and every transaction. So, they are different.
5 It's a belt-and-suspenders approach. It was
6 clearly contemplated in Dodd-Frank.

7 And the only other point I wanted to
8 make was that there was some discussion of
9 regionalized pools of capital and fragmentation
10 around the world. Well, a goal of Dodd-Frank is
11 to shield or protect the U.S. economy from
12 practices that create excessive risk, and,
13 frankly, if we get some fragmentation where you
14 have one market over there which is not taking
15 margin, which is engaging in risky practices, and
16 then connections from that market into the U.S.
17 economy are perhaps reduced or cut, that's to me
18 perfectly in line with what Dodd-Frank intends.

19 MR. TAFARA: I said John. I meant
20 Robert. Apologies. And then Jackie.

21 MR. REILLY: That's fine just as long as
22 you smile when you say it.

1 First of all, I think margin
2 requirements should be transactional, but I think
3 we should take a step back -- and, remember, we're
4 talking about margin requirements on uncleared
5 swaps. So, really, to me the first question is
6 we're looking at different countries -- are the
7 clearing requirements comparable? Will other
8 countries have something that looks like our
9 end-user exemption? How about hedging? How does
10 that fit into the end-user exemption? So, all
11 those things have to be lined up if we're going to
12 take something other than a non-transactional
13 approach to it.

14 The other point I would make, is that
15 for non-banks, swap dealers that are not
16 affiliated with banks, the capital requirements
17 are very much tied to the level of uncleared
18 swaps, so to the extent you don't have a cleared
19 swap the capital requirement does go up. And so
20 there is a bit more of a relationship between
21 margin and capital.

22 MR. TAFARA: Okay, thank you. Jackie,

1 if you may, get us started on the next series of
2 questions.

3 MS. MESA: This morning we spoke a
4 little bit about branches and affiliates and
5 subsidiaries of U.S. parents, and I want to dive
6 into that a little deeper regarding registration.
7 We also talked about direct and significant effect
8 on the U.S. And so my question is when should a
9 branch -- and you can treat these differently --
10 affiliate or a subsidiary of a U.S. parent located
11 abroad be subject to registration? Should it
12 depend on just the fact that there is risk
13 transfer to the U.S. parent unless there is direct
14 and significant effect on the U.S.? Or should it
15 be subject to the level of trades it has with the
16 U.S.?

17 MR. TAFARA: Thank you, Wally.

18 MR. TURBEVILLE: I was waiting. I
19 wanted to counterpunch.

20 The answer is affiliate branch. The
21 issue is not about that. The issue, to me, is a
22 two-prong issue. One is, is the risk of that

1 entity effectively transferred to the U.S. bank?
2 And the second is are they, in effect, the same
3 businesses, right? So, guarantees, those sorts of
4 issues are very important. But also are they same
5 business? Do they run a consolidated book?

6 One of the things that is talked about
7 here is the agony of having to use subsidiaries.
8 The other thing that gets argued about in this
9 whole area is well, we want to consolidate our
10 books with our subsidiaries. So, you know, I
11 think the fact is that it's a -- probably most
12 books are consolidated above the banks that we're
13 talking about here. That infers strongly that
14 it's all the same business, and it's not that hard
15 to consolidate books with disparate branches and
16 affiliates involved. So, I think in most cases
17 it's actually going to be the same entity. That's
18 just based on what I've heard people say, but that
19 is the test as far as I'm concerned. It's not a
20 question of where is it organized? Is it a
21 branch? Is it an affiliate? Is it the same
22 business? Is the risk transferred?

1 MR. TAFARA: This time, John.

2 MR. McCARTHY: I mean, GETCO is a firm
3 that trades only on centrally cleared exchange
4 traded markets, and -- I'm sorry -- so if we're
5 required to register our affiliates in Singapore
6 and London simply because we're a U.S.-based
7 market maker, it will put us in a unique
8 position -- vis-à-vis does the (inaudible)
9 providers that are obviously located only in those
10 other jurisdictions, and we would -- you know, I
11 don't want to say we would have -- you know, we
12 would obviously have additional requirements, but
13 we would basically have to comply with two
14 regimes, and I think it's fair to say that could
15 put us at a competitive disadvantage in terms of
16 just burdening us with costs that our, you know,
17 competitors would not have. And it's a very, very
18 competitive environment in both the U.K. and Asian
19 markets. So, again, a lot of the regulations
20 would be duplicative and probably could leverage
21 off each other. But, again, I think it would put
22 us likely at a disadvantage, in my judgment.

1 MR. BUSSEY: John, wouldn't you just put
2 a U.K. holding company over GETCO and have the
3 foreign affiliates subs of the U.K. holding
4 company, thus getting out of this?

5 MR. McCARTHY: Could do that, and
6 obviously there's costs associated with that.
7 But, again it seems to be -- it's not really the
8 preference that the regulators want for us to kind
9 of create, you know, a much more -- to create an
10 infrastructure that is only designed to basically
11 avoid registration. It just doesn't make sense to
12 me.

13 MR. BUSSEY: I'm not suggesting that's
14 the preference; it just -- I'm trying to get it
15 for making a distinction it is really turning on
16 who the parent is and where they're located.

17 MR. McCARTHY: And that's, you know,
18 with our outside counsel that's kind of the
19 suggestion they've made. But, again, it seems to
20 be -- you know, it seems to be hopefully
21 unnecessary is what --

22 MR. TAFARA: Thanks for stirring things

1 up a bit, Brian.

2 Marcelo?

3 MR. RIFFAUD: Yeah, I have a problem
4 with the whole idea that if I'm a -- and I don't
5 have dog perhaps in this particular fight. Let me
6 start with that. But if I'm a U.S. company and I
7 set up a subsidiary overseas for reasons of
8 employment rules, local tax rules, etc., and I'm
9 engaged in the swap business, absent my guarantee
10 in that subsidiary's performance, I don't see why
11 that should subject it to registry, and it's doing
12 offshore business, so it's not dealing with U.S.
13 persons. I do not understand why that should
14 subject that subsidiary or the parent to
15 registration under Dodd-Frank. I don't see that.
16 You could get there perhaps in some other odd way
17 of Dodd-Frank. I don't know if you think that
18 somehow it is such a material subsidiary and the
19 U.S. entity is somehow a SIFI. I don't know. But
20 from the perspective of Title VII, I just do not
21 see that. I do not see that happening.

22 And I would go a little bit further.

1 I'm not entirely sure the guarantee carries you
2 into a conclusion.

3 MR. TAFARA: Well, nobody's spoken to
4 Ananda's point from earlier where he raised the
5 directness and the significance and the impact on
6 the U.S. marketplace. So, it is very possible
7 that you would have an entity that is not U.S.
8 based that has enough of an impact such that your
9 answer or your conclusion is different.

10 And maybe Ananda has raised his flag to
11 say it again and probe a little bit more, so I'll
12 turn it to Ananda.

13 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: The other concern is
14 let's say that there is a concern that if our
15 reach did not go into a subsidiary or an affiliate
16 but that's the way you structure business. I'm
17 not saying any of these fine companies here would
18 do that, but let's say you have another company --
19 that's how you'd structure your business to evade
20 -- avoid -- whatever -- this Dodd-Frank, that you
21 would not do any business out of the U.S. bank but
22 you'd rather do it out of your subsidiary. Now,

1 is that realistic, No. 1? And if you guys are
2 saying no, never going to happen, maybe we should
3 think -- I don't know that it will affect the way
4 we think.

5 MR. TAFARA: Given that challenge, why
6 don't we start with Stephen and then Marcus.

7 MR. O'CONNOR: So, I think that to start
8 booking business offshore to escape the reach of
9 Dodd-Frank wouldn't help with regard to U.S.
10 clients, right, because those -- by the fact the
11 clients were in the U.S., that would capture --
12 they would be captured by the transactional-level
13 rules of Dodd-Frank. And I think, though, where
14 we're going to end up, which is a trend we've seen
15 already, is that when trading in a particular
16 jurisdiction that banks globally will tend toward
17 booking transactions in a legal entity in that
18 jurisdiction. So -- but I don't see that as being
19 arbitrage or rule avoidance. I think if European
20 subsidiaries of U.S. banks trading with Europeans
21 clients -- I think that's a fact (inaudible)
22 that's fine as is booking U.S. client business

1 onshore in the U.S. and a branch for all
2 subsidiary for overseas banks. So, I think that
3 you will see that pattern developing, but I'm not
4 sure it's avoidance. It's more just censoring
5 businesses in the right jurisdiction and local --
6 as mentioned earlier by Marcelo -- local tax rules
7 or business conduct rules or regulation might
8 force that even more than it has been in the past.
9 But I don't think -- by virtue of the fact that
10 the clients in the U.S. will be captured whatever,
11 I don't think there's a good tool for institutions
12 not in the room to employ with that regard.

13 MR. TAFARA: Marcus.

14 MR. STANLEY: Just in response to what
15 Marcelo said earlier about the guarantee. It only
16 seemed to apply that even if there was a guarantee
17 it wouldn't be appropriate for the subsidiary to
18 be regulated. We really have to make sure -- I
19 think we have the tools here to avoid kind of a
20 Cayman Islands situation, and I think the burden
21 of proof needs to be very, very much on the bank
22 itself to show that the U.S. entity is not going

1 to end up being responsible for those losses. As
2 I said during the first panel, before the crisis
3 the argument was made -- this was the whole
4 justification for off balance sheet entities was
5 that the parent company would not be responsible
6 for their debts. And of course no one would have
7 loaned to them unless it was known that implicitly
8 the parent company, through a wink and a nod,
9 actually would be responsible for their debts, and
10 indeed the parent companies did have to take those
11 entities back on their balance sheet when they got
12 in trouble. So, you really want to cease an iron
13 clad wall, it seems to me, and you want the burden
14 of proof to be on the bank that's claiming that
15 subsidiary is fully walled off in order to really
16 demonstrate that.

17 MR. TAFARA: This affords me an
18 opportunity to ask a question I had wanted to ask
19 during the first panel of Thomas from Goldman
20 Sachs, and I think he suggested that --

21 SPEAKER: Go ahead.

22 MR. TAFARA: Yeah, well, I'm asking you

1 now, though. (Laughter) He had suggested that
2 guarantees in essence were a surrogate for
3 regulation, and now that you have regulation of
4 all these entities in the derivatives base, that
5 it may be less necessary, but the question I had
6 was had we seen them disappear? Are there
7 guarantees still being provided and asked for?
8 And I think that's a question probably I'd like to
9 hear an answer from a number of people around the
10 table. So, Sarah, since you have your flag up,
11 why don't you go first.

12 MS. LEE: Sure. But I just first want
13 to answer Ananda's question. I mean, we are Bank
14 of America, so I think it's going to be difficult
15 for us just to suddenly (inaudible) overnight and
16 become banks of Singapore or something like that.
17 I mean, we have a massive customer base in the
18 U.S., and it would require all those U.S.
19 customers just to move offshore as well. And I
20 think the key points that I want to make are in
21 terms of how we set up our business, and I'm sure
22 many other large financial institutions are the

1 same. You know, we set ourselves up with
2 subsidiaries and branches around the world. In
3 Europe we have subsidiaries that we operate out
4 just to comply with the European passporting
5 requirements. In Asia, many of the jurisdictions
6 require either a local banking entity or a foreign
7 branch of a bank to operate onshore in those
8 jurisdictions. And those subsidiaries and
9 branches have been set up for decades, operating
10 under legitimate business reasons. They were not
11 set up to evade Dodd-Frank.

12 And I think I do want to re-emphasize
13 the point that if we -- yeah, I know we've got
14 this challenge that the U.S. is first at the
15 moment and the rules and regulation around the
16 world is a different pace. But I think the
17 challenge for us as a U.S. financial institution
18 is, if we are required to comply with the U.S.
19 rules in those foreign jurisdictions with our
20 foreign clients, we will struggle to continue to
21 do business in those jurisdictions, and we will
22 struggle not only to compete but also to manage

1 risk of those transactions to be able to book and
2 manage the risk in those jurisdictions. So, I
3 recognize there is a challenge in terms of how do
4 we deal with ensuring that we as an institution
5 are safe and sound, particularly as we own
6 companies all around the world.

7 And again, I go back to my point. I
8 think it's important that we use tools, other
9 entity-level tools like capital, to manage that in
10 this interim period while the rest of the world is
11 sort of catching up with our regulation.

12 MR. TAFARA: Angie, and then I think
13 I'll turn to the regulators who raise their flags,
14 and then Chris and then Stephen, too. So, Angie,
15 why don't you go first.

16 MS. KARNA: Sure. Just addressing your
17 question and Tom's earlier point and something
18 else that was said. It's important to
19 re-emphasize that one of the changes in Dodd-Frank
20 that is not going to go away is we are not going
21 to be able to do swap-dealing activities with U.S.
22 clients out of unregulated entities -- period. We

1 could pre-Dodd-Frank. We can't now. And that's a
2 fundamental change that we can't lose sight of. I
3 don't see any discussion about comparable
4 standards abroad. We'll also be referencing for
5 all of the institutions in this room
6 well-regulated entities, and we wouldn't expect
7 you to ever sign off on an unregulated entity.
8 And in fact, we have three primary trading
9 entities around the world, all of which are
10 regulated -- all of which will be regulated
11 post-Dodd-Frank. Our U.S. entity actually is the
12 only one that hasn't been regulated, but the
13 majority of our business is done out of our
14 European entity, which is regulated and our
15 Japanese entity, which is regulated. So, I wanted
16 to just highlight that that is a distinction with
17 pre- and post-Dodd-Frank in the United States.
18 We're not going to have an unregulated entity
19 facing U.S. clients.

20 MR. TAFARA: Dan --

21 MR. BERKOVITZ: Thank you. I'd just
22 like to follow up on a point that was made about a

1 European affiliate or subsidiary that is -- in any
2 foreign jurisdiction that is set up for tax
3 reasons -- whatever reasons -- and that if it's
4 really a separate entity, then the Dodd-Frank
5 requirements shouldn't apply. But then we get
6 into the question, on the other hand, of inter-
7 affiliate transactions where entities are also
8 asking, at the same time, although, for certain
9 purposes, that these entities are considered
10 separate entities and now you don't apply
11 Dodd-Frank requirements to the other entities.
12 And yet for the inter-affiliate transaction
13 exception, for lack of a better term, we're also
14 being asked to provide an exception, because,
15 really, they're the same entity and this is just
16 distributing risk internally, and we just want one
17 single entity to face the market. And yet not all
18 of those single entities are being regulated under
19 Dodd-Frank when they face the market. So, I'm
20 just wondering if there's a disconnect or an
21 incongruity between, on the one hand, not applying
22 Dodd-Frank to an affiliate or a subsidiary because

1 it's established in a different jurisdiction and
2 also at the same time requesting an inter-
3 affiliate exemption from clearing requirements and
4 other requirements to Dodd-Frank, because they're
5 really the same entity.

6 MR. TAFARA: Let's take some answers to
7 Dan's question and then turn to Jackie and to
8 Robert.

9 MR. RIFFAUD: You're asking me, Dan.
10 We're just asking for a lot more than we should.
11 No, when I think of the inter-affiliate
12 transactions -- and I may be coming at this from
13 my own paradigm -- for us it's inter-branch,
14 right? So, we don't have this situation where we
15 have a subsidiary that is doing swaps. We book
16 all of the soon-to-be-regulated businesses in
17 branches of our New York branch, London branch,
18 branches of our home bank. So, when we think
19 about inter-affiliate transactions regardless of
20 the initial trigger to the market, whether it's a
21 U.S. person or non-U.S. person, we think of it as
22 moving the risk within the same legal entity from

1 a corporate structure and from a credit exposure
2 perspective but across branches, which really are
3 regulatory concepts that come out of the banking
4 world. And then therefore at some level it's
5 tantamount to a journal, but you need to have good
6 books and records to manage it. And it all serves
7 centralized management. You have human resources
8 that have the right expertise in particular
9 jurisdictions, etc., and you want to have the same
10 risk management, risk compliance function over it,
11 so you move it to the logical central location.
12 But you do make a good point, and I do not know
13 the answer. If I was subsidiaries doing business
14 outside and it's on a U.S. asset and you end up
15 doing inter-affiliate -- truly inter-affiliate
16 trades, different legal entities back to some
17 central book -- it's a good question.

18 Now, I would say that if you are -- if
19 one of the entities that's receiving that, the
20 central -- if it is already a regulated entity, it
21 has its own -- that's an exposure that has its own
22 capital that attaches to that activity, there may

1 not be inter-affiliate margin. But it needs to
2 manage that risk, so our prudential rules are
3 already attached to that. So, I'm sure I see an
4 end run unless it starts at an unregulated entity
5 and ends up at an unregulated entity.

6 MR. TAFARA: Wally.

7 MR. TURBEVILLE: To me, that's all part
8 of the same issue of is it a common business? Is
9 the -- how inter-affiliate transactions work,
10 because I think in fact it will track back to what
11 is the real business involved. So, if the real
12 business is a U.S. bank and there are subsidiaries
13 through inter-affiliate arrangements, it becomes
14 obvious that the whole thing is run -- risk
15 management, personnel, everything is run from one
16 entity, and the risk is in one entity and the
17 profit eventually gets to one entity. It seems
18 like that should be the same entity. And the
19 result shouldn't be any different if a U.S.
20 domiciled company does an activity as opposed to a
21 subsidiary who then has that kind of relationship
22 with a parent. The result should be the same as

1 far as Dodd-Frank goes.

2 And I think in actuality whether there
3 are branches or not, it just makes -- it actually
4 should be expected that in a lot of these
5 organizations there are centrally managed books.
6 Risk is centrally managed. The risk professionals
7 are in common. And ultimately the profit-and-loss
8 is a result that's important to the parent. So,
9 in fact, why it's really important -- that's sort
10 of how it all works, and it just strikes us as not
11 being sensible, that in fact, yes, all the
12 subsidiaries are out there. The branches are out
13 there for regulatory and tax and other
14 motivations. But if the business is really in one
15 place, that's where it should be regulated.

16 MR. TAFARA: Chris, I realize you had
17 your flag up before Dan's question. I don't know
18 whether there was something else you wanted to get
19 to before we moved on or whether you want to get
20 to that as well as Dan's question. We're going to
21 turn to you.

22 MR. ALLEN: I think I'm about three

1 questions behind, actually, in terms of the list
2 of notes I've made here, but just very quickly on
3 the most recent question, I mean, I think there is
4 that tension. I think there is the difficulty
5 embedded within that (inaudible). But I want to
6 just comment though as a bit of a qualification,
7 too, that even in today's environment entities
8 don't just liberally take exposure on that kind of
9 inter-group basis without proper consideration of
10 a number of the factors that can really drive
11 whether that makes economic sense to do, such as
12 capital, because, for example, there are many
13 circumstances. It depends where the entities are
14 allocated as to how this exactly plays out. But
15 there are circumstances in which if U.S. and the
16 European entities take derivative exposure to each
17 other which is not collateralized, then you can
18 attract one for one capital deduction in respect
19 of every dollar of exposure that sits behind that
20 relationship. So, there are other incentives
21 which go beyond what we might describe as conducts
22 of business over the forms of application of the

1 rules, which will incentivize behaviors which are
2 already there, and so I'd simply encourage that
3 those be borne in mind and factored into the
4 consideration for this point.

5 The other point I just wanted to mention
6 was -- it was two very brief (inaudible) things,
7 if I may. One was the motivation behind European
8 incorporation, for example. Somebody touched upon
9 the passports. It's hugely important for firms,
10 both those that are outside the European economic
11 area and also those that are within it. Quite
12 frankly, to (inaudible) avail themselves of the
13 passporting rights which you can obtain under the
14 banking consolidation directive or MiFID depending
15 on the type of MC in question. This is very solid
16 reasons for wishing to incorporate and establish
17 in European countries if you are intending to have
18 a client investor base which has a European focus
19 to it.

20 And the final point was -- I think
21 Stephen may have mentioned this -- but it's just
22 to reiterate perhaps the obvious point, which is

1 in circumstances where you have that non-U.S.
2 incorporated MNC. Of course as soon as it touches
3 the U.S. in terms of whatever formulation of the
4 U.S. person test reapply it is, of course,
5 straight back into the realms of developing
6 conducts of business rules that would be required
7 to govern that activity. We've already talked
8 about prudential regulation and how that might be
9 subject to home state deference. But we mentioned
10 before about it would only be in circumstances
11 where the U.S. authorities were satisfied that the
12 standards batch prudential regulation was
13 comparable and robust. Thanks.

14 MR. TAFARA: Angie, is your flag up from
15 last time, or is up again -- before I turn to
16 Jackie?

17 MS. KARNA: I think it's still relevant.

18 MR. TAFARA: It's not your question.

19 MS. KARNA: It actually relates to Dan's
20 question and also what Chris just said, and just
21 following up what Marcelo had said earlier.

22 We are an institution that does not have

1 branches, so I just wanted to clarify the facts
2 around inter-affiliate trades for us since we
3 don't have branches and Marcelo was talking about
4 branches.

5 As Chris said, whichever regulated
6 entity directly deals with a U.S. client will be
7 registered under Dodd-Frank. That U.S. client,
8 however, may like -- the typical reason why we
9 would have inter-affiliate transactions is because
10 that client wants to get exposure to an asset
11 class that is risk managed more appropriately in
12 another region. So, from the first panel, an
13 institutional investor who wants to risk manage a
14 risk in Tokyo may enter into a swap with the
15 entity that directly transacts with U.S. clients,
16 but that entity will do a back-to-back swap of
17 that Tokyo best managed risk with our Japanese
18 broker-dealer. So, it's not just that it's the
19 same legal entity. The entity that is facing the
20 U.S. client will be well regulated, and we see no
21 reason why because that client wants to get
22 exposure to something that is best risk managed in

1 another reason why that inter-affiliate swap
2 should be subject to additional regulation.

3 MR. TAFARA: I'm going to take questions
4 from the regulators. We'll take a series of
5 questions here and then turn to the panel. So,
6 Jackie first, then Robert, then Brian.

7 MS. MESA: Before we completely shift
8 from this topic, I just had one more follow-up,
9 and it has something to do with what Steve
10 O'Connor said earlier, which is that businesses
11 set up affiliates and subsidiaries and have them
12 today in foreign locations for legitimate business
13 purposes. But the SEC and CFTC both have an
14 anti-evasion provision in the statute that allows
15 us to apply Dodd-Frank regulation to anticipate
16 evasion or to prevent evasion. And my question is
17 this, how do we determine what is a legitimate
18 business shift, so doing business out of your
19 affiliates with other U.S. parent affiliates, and
20 what is an evasion? So, I look to our panel of
21 experts on this question.

22 MR. TAFARA: Why don't we answer that

1 one first before we move to Robert and Brian. So,
2 how do we judge anti-evasion? Starting with
3 Marcus.

4 MR. STANLEY: I think it shouldn't
5 revolve around the subjective motivation of the
6 entity for moving the -- for perhaps creating a
7 subsidiary or taking an action outside of the
8 U.S., because there's always a set of reasons that
9 one can cite for that. It really has to go back
10 to the basic goals of the statute in terms of
11 protecting the U.S. economy against risk. And if
12 there's an action that would end up that has the
13 capacity to rebound on the U.S. economy in a
14 significant way, then it really doesn't matter why
15 the entity started to take that action in the
16 first place. It's evading the goals of the
17 statute.

18 MR. TAFARA: Marcelo?

19 MR. RIFFAUD: Thank you. I disagree a
20 little bit with that answer. Maybe a lot. But
21 it's disagreement at whatever percent. I do in
22 fact think that scienter matters when you're

1 talking about evasive activity or not. I think
2 it's one thing for someone to create a shingled
3 entity incorporated in a foreign jurisdiction and
4 not do everything that one would normally do when
5 you create an entity to actually go into business
6 in a foreign jurisdiction, which includes
7 registrations, human resources of a physical
8 plant. There's a lot that is present when you're
9 not in an evasive mode.

10 The fact that someone chooses to create
11 an entity and conduct non-U.S. business outside of
12 that entity as a subsidiary of the parent of the
13 U.S. parent in a foreign jurisdiction is not, per
14 se, evasive. The minute you touch a U.S. person,
15 as we've said repeatedly, you now have U.S. rules
16 that will attach. So, your concern -- and I don't
17 think it's invalid, but your concern is going to
18 some of more systemic, right? Is there something
19 systemic about that? And at that point you go
20 back to significant and direct effects. I see
21 that as a very high hurdle to pass before you get
22 there. We had a little research done on

1 significant and direct effects, and it is not a
2 merely adverse, competitive effect in the U.S,
3 market. It is more, it would be manipulating a
4 market that has effect in the U.S., something of
5 that significance.

6 MR. TAFARA: Your approach makes it not
7 a matter of policy but a matter of law
8 enforcement. I mean, scienter in essence requires
9 that we investigate and make a determination that
10 there was the intent to not comply with knowledge
11 and forethought. Is that the right line to draw?
12 Is the right line to draw as between policy and
13 law enforcement into fall on the side of law
14 enforcement? Or is the anti-evasion consideration
15 something that goes beyond simple law enforcement?

16 I'll let you go, and then Wally wants to
17 jump in on the subject.

18 MR. RIFFAUD: Okay, just one answer. I
19 find -- because I come at it from the position of
20 scienter and evasion -- I don't think you can
21 conclude ex ante that you are -- that there is
22 evasive activity occurring.

1 MR. TAFARA: Wally.

2 MR. TURBEVILLE: About three decades ago
3 I went to law school. Scierter is a term of art
4 as I recall, is a term of art that has a fairly
5 high level of proof required to it, so that's a
6 loaded term, and I see nothing in here that would
7 suggest that you have to have scierter to meet the
8 standard. It's a -- there are levels of intent
9 and mental approach to things, and scierter just
10 isn't -- sorry, I understand what's being said,
11 and I understand that the level is being set high
12 for a reason.

13 Another thing that I wanted to say is
14 just everybody remember, there's -- for both the
15 SEC and for the CFTC, there are two completely
16 separate things going on. One is the evasion
17 issue, and the other is do the activities have the
18 requisite effect or is there a business going on
19 from the SEC side? So, there's two different
20 things. So, the evasion is a different kind of
21 activity, which assumes that the first test, which
22 is -- there's the activity that has the effect on

1 the economy going on, or is there a business being
2 conducted that's a U.S.-based business in reality?
3 If it's not caught by one of the first test, then,
4 well, it might be because there was an evasionary
5 purpose to it. So, basically two things: two
6 levels of tests and scienter is not necessary in
7 my view.

8 MR. TAFARA: I see nobody else
9 volunteering to answer this question. Maybe we
10 should then turn to Robert to ask his question and
11 then to Brian.

12 MR. COOK: Thanks. I wanted to ask a
13 follow-up question of Stephen about something Tom
14 said (laughter), something I think he said of
15 Stephen, and it has echoes of something that Angie
16 was touching on, too, I believe. I think you said
17 -- correct me if I got this wrong -- that you
18 think we may be heading towards an approach where
19 global firms have a local entity that faces a
20 counterparty, and I presume that part of that
21 general model would be that essentially client
22 risk is being managed local to the client and

1 market risk is being managed local to the market.
2 So, U.S. counterparties would face a U.S. entity,
3 and if the risk was dealing with a European
4 underlier, that would be moved over to Europe
5 where the European experts could manage it and
6 vice versa and that that might be a way that the
7 market will evolve in light of the direction you
8 perceive the regulatory environment moving. So,
9 first, did I get that right? Is that -- do you
10 think that's where we're heading? And I welcome
11 other people to come in on this as well, on these
12 questions.

13 No. 2, is that a good thing or a bad
14 thing? Are you saying we're heading that
15 direction and it's unfortunate, or that that's a
16 logical place for us to end up in a way that
17 resolves some of these questions? And I guess how
18 does this compare to the concept of one global
19 booking entity in terms of the policy prospective
20 -- the advantages and disadvantages?

21 MR. TAFARA: I'm conscious of time,
22 Stephen, so I want Brian to get his question in as

1 well and we can answer all the questions --

2 MR. BUSSEY: This was -- the key
3 question.

4 MR. TAFARA: I've been overruled.
5 Stephen.

6 (Laughter)

7 MR. O'CONNOR: I think yes, you
8 correctly interpreted what I said. And this has
9 been the situation for, you know, a long time, but
10 for varying reasons, typically that local clients
11 are more comfortable with a local entity, local
12 regulations, or tax rules or other might require
13 that, or capital treatments also. So -- but I
14 think the trend will accelerate to the extent that
15 -- for instance, financial institutions had
16 previously booked European client business in U.S.
17 institutes that might now get booked more in
18 Europe.

19 And I think those drivers that I
20 mentioned, that you mentioned, another one might
21 be that clients typically would have one master
22 agreement with a local entity. So, to the extent

1 that they traded in multiple markets, that's a
2 case where there would be a local entity with the
3 relationship and the principle counterparty risk,
4 but then the market risk would be better managed
5 elsewhere around. So, that's where you get the
6 inter-affiliate transactions.

7 So, I think it's a trend. It's a model
8 that has always existed and I think that will
9 continue to be the trend. As to whether that's
10 good or bad, I think I'd go back to my opening
11 point, which was to the extent we can have
12 harmonization of rules and proper recognition of
13 the jurisdiction of, you know, co-regulators
14 around the world, then I think that's an okay
15 outcome.

16 MR. TAFARA: So -- but the second part
17 of this question -- I'm not sure I understood the
18 answer to it. In other words, you have local
19 entities manage local risk. What does that mean
20 for global risk management at the end of the day?
21 Is that something that will be complementary? Can
22 it be done in a complementary fashion despite

1 moving toward local entities for management --

2 MR. O'CONNOR: No, I think it can be,
3 but it does involve inter-affiliate transactions
4 that we mentioned earlier. So, if you take the
5 case of a bank that has -- or a client in Europe
6 that has its main relationship with a bank entity
7 in Europe, be that a subsidiary of a U.S. bank or
8 a European bank, then that bank will probably have
9 trading desks in the U.S., certain U.S. product,
10 and I think it's most efficient and provides most
11 liquidity to markets if all the risk in the U.S.
12 product is managed in the U.S. And so that's how
13 you see these patents of booking entities
14 evolving. Is that -- that can be done?

15 It is done today and, you know, will be
16 done in the future, and just picking up, actually,
17 on something that was said earlier, I think that
18 the capital is the key here. I think it's Angie
19 who said that. And I would agree with that. I
20 would also disagree with the point made that
21 capital and collateral are both needed. I think
22 it is, you know, someone who's been fairly close

1 to development of BIS. So, I think that the
2 capital regimes as they've evolved over the years
3 have one goal, and that's to ensure that the
4 financial institution at the end of the day is
5 robust and, to the extent that our counterparty
6 relationships that are not margined, then capital
7 goes up, and it goes up punitively with regard to
8 inter-affiliate transactions, as mentioned before.

9 So, if you took a look at global
10 institutions now, you would see in many cases that
11 banks voluntarily decided to post margin on
12 affiliate transactions to keep risk down from a
13 capital perspective. So, I think the models exist
14 today and they will continue, and it is possible
15 to manage risk on the one hand from a global
16 perspective and to have the client relationship
17 booked at the local level.

18 MR. TAFARA: So, Wally, then Chris, then
19 Angie, and then Marcelo.

20 So, Wally?

21 MR. TURBEVILLE: Banks have crude oil
22 desks, natural gas desks, interest rate desks,

1 Japanese desks. To me, it's -- of course there
2 are different ways to compartmentalize risk and to
3 address them, and the people who have a good
4 handle on those kinds of risks should be
5 responsible for doing that. But then there's also
6 the global risk issue, and certainly the fact is
7 that the business -- if you define the business --
8 if the business defines itself globally, then that
9 is the entity; that's the one doing business;
10 that's the one that should be the focal point.
11 And, unfortunately, you know, in a perfect world
12 all the regulation would be completely harmonized
13 and uniform and then all of these -- there
14 wouldn't be any difference between the crude oil
15 desk and the interest rate desk versus U.S.
16 business and Japanese business. Then having said
17 all that, it isn't true. It isn't -- we do
18 organize ourselves territorially. So -- but the
19 fact is that's fine, the argument for the greatest
20 flexibility possible, and not shutting yourself
21 off with, like, universal rules that create
22 definitions that are very restrictive I think is

1 so very important in this area, because one would
2 want to replicate as much as possible a harmonious
3 regulatory environment that recognizes the
4 international quality of the business.

5 MR. ALLEN: Right. I just wanted to
6 reiterate the point which Stephen made there about
7 that relationship between capital and margin,
8 because it does strike me it is important, even in
9 the context, as I mentioned before, of inter-group
10 transactions, because the capital consequence of
11 not collateralizing those transactions on
12 occasions depending on the fact that you have can
13 be very substantial indeed. And so there is that
14 embedded and sensitive to consider
15 collateralization on an inter-affiliate basis over
16 and above the conducts of business requirements to
17 do so.

18 The other point I just wanted to make,
19 though, and it's slightly a variance of Stephen's
20 comments about the use of local entities.
21 Obviously, there are institutions that are
22 organized that way, but I just wanted to make the

1 point that there are a number of -- a lot of
2 organizations that are organized completely
3 differently according to a universal banking model
4 with universal booking sensors that tend to use a
5 single legal entity structure pretty much
6 throughout the world. My observation around that,
7 among many other things, is that that doesn't in
8 any way find the face of the capacity to risk
9 manage at the local basis, so an institution such
10 as Barclays will transact swaps in the United
11 States currently through its main London legal
12 entity. But that doesn't detract from the fact
13 that the specialists in the swaps market are those
14 based in New York for the institution trading in
15 that local market.

16 The other thing that it doesn't
17 frustrate in any way is the capacity to comply
18 with local conducts of business rules as they are
19 applied throughout the world. Operating on a
20 universal bank model through the same legal entity
21 doesn't in any way diminish the obligation on
22 Barclays to comply with the MAS' conducts of

1 business rules in Singapore or those that might
2 apply in Hong Kong or, quite frankly, any of the
3 markets. So, I just wanted to put that
4 counterpoint in there because we'll all have to
5 see a lot of institutions that operate on that
6 global model, but clearly as a consequence of what
7 we were describing before, the risk of
8 subsidiarization, which derives from standards of
9 conducts of business applying to, for example,
10 U.K. entities in respect of its global businesses,
11 not just those that have the U.S. connection could
12 cause that to change. But I wouldn't say that
13 that's the case as it stands today.

14 MR. TAFARA: Okay, I have Angie, then
15 Marcelo, then Marcus, followed by Robert, and then
16 we'll wrap up with Sarah and then turn to Brian's
17 question.

18 So, Angie, please.

19 MS. KARNA: Sure, just following up on
20 something that Chris and Stephen just said. We
21 are -- we do see the direction of the market that
22 Stephen highlighted with a potential for localized

1 client facing and market risk-containing entities,
2 but we don't like it very much. In particular, we
3 don't like it because many of our clients don't
4 like it. Some clients absolutely would like to
5 face a U.S. entity for U.S. regulatory reasons --
6 and when I say "face," I mean have the U.S. entity
7 being a booking entity. But, for the most part,
8 the very large, internationally focused
9 institutions would like to have all of their risk
10 in as few entities as possible. So, one thing
11 that we have thought about a lot when we think
12 about how we conduct our business today is we
13 fully recognize that under Dodd-Frank you need a
14 swap dealer or a securities-based swap dealer to
15 interact with U.S. clients. But we think that if
16 you look at something like the securities world
17 today, we will have a fully regulated U.S. entity
18 face U.S. clients, be responsible for all
19 transactional requirements under Dodd-Frank, but
20 then allow those transactions to be booked in the
21 entity that they wanted to be booked in, which is
22 outside of the United States of America, and have

1 the entity requirements for that booking entity be
2 something that the CFTC and the SEC decide are of
3 a comparable standard. So, we think that model of
4 having a fully regulated swap dealer or
5 securities-based swap dealer in the United States
6 that the SEC and CFTC can look to, to meet and be
7 responsible for all Dodd-Frank transaction
8 requirements, works. And it also allows our
9 clients to have as much market risk as possible
10 in, let's say, a foreign entity where they have a
11 lot of other transactions.

12 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: So, I hate to
13 interrupt. So, you're saying -- the example --
14 that entity A is the registrant.

15 MS. KARNA: Yes.

16 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Entity B is the
17 party that's actually the legal counterparty to a
18 U.S. person.

19 MS. KARNA: Correct.

20 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: And that don't
21 regulate entity B?

22 MS. KARNA: You don't regulate entity B

1 if you're satisfied that entity A is an affiliated
2 entity, and entity B's entity-level requirements
3 are of a comparable standard.

4 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: There is a mismatch,
5 right? There's a mismatch, because entity A is
6 not the counterparty, so the same plan I'm going
7 to make goes to branches of U.S. -- of foreign
8 banks. (A) We cannot register a branch. A branch
9 is not a legal person. Nobody's been able to
10 convince me that a branch is a legal person, so we
11 have to register a legal person. That's my
12 thinking. I'm not finding permission. But the
13 example you gave, Angie, why are we doing it?
14 Because we're not regulating the entity that is
15 contracting with the U.S. counterparty.

16 MS. KARNA: You're regulating the entity
17 that's on the hook for making sure that the
18 transaction is clear --

19 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Right.

20 MS. KARNA: -- that the transaction is
21 trade reported; that the transaction is traded on
22 a U.S.-regulated SEF --

1 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Which is not
2 accountable. Would you admit that the entity --
3 what you're proposing is we do not regulate the
4 entity that is the counterparty to the U.S.
5 person.

6 MS. KARNA: Assuming that you're
7 comfortable that that entity is regulated in a
8 regulatory environment that you're comfortable
9 with and that you have some kind of information
10 sharing and a way to get it through the U.S.
11 registrant.

12 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Okay.

13 MR. BUSSEY: Angie, you're suggesting
14 that in a situation where it's just a booking
15 entity; it's not having any other type of
16 interaction with this person.

17 MS. KARNA: Correct. Correct. I think
18 there's two potential -- for the client who wants
19 to face the global non-U.S. entity, there's two
20 options. All the client contacts are the
21 responsibility can be, one, by that foreign entity
22 or, alternatively, all of the client contacts, all

1 of the responsibility for compliance with
2 Dodd-Frank can come from a U.S.-registered
3 affiliate that's a swap dealer. In either model,
4 both of them we think should be feasible under the
5 rules, and both of them give you the right to
6 regulate a swap dealer or securities-based swap
7 deal.

8 MR. TAFARA: Marcelo.

9 MR. RIFFAUD: I just wanted to add to
10 Chris' point that in lieu with Angie's, we are not
11 seeing this move that Stephen is seeing maybe that
12 we are at Universal Bank. We're seeing -- there
13 was a little of that immediately post-Lehman.
14 People were concerned about the workout and all
15 these types of issues, right? But what we are
16 continuing to see is that people want to face the
17 highest credit quality entity in the organization,
18 and they want the benefits -- very few of our
19 clients are not international. They're trading
20 everywhere. They want the netting benefits, the
21 offset of exposure benefits that you get by facing
22 the single entity through a master agreement.

1 MR. TAFARA: Marcus.

2 MR. STANLEY: Just to repeat a couple of
3 things -- one, this issue of deference versus
4 delegation that came up before, you could
5 certainly maintain your authority under Dodd-Frank
6 over these entities and examine the regulations
7 that these other regulated entities fell under and
8 find that they satisfied Dodd-Frank requirements.
9 It's a little different than completely -- than
10 saying that you're going to permit a company that
11 is not regulated under Dodd-Frank to transact with
12 a U.S. person. But it could get to the same goals
13 in terms of reducing duplication or extra
14 bureaucracy.

15 And I just also wanted to say something
16 about this margin versus capital issue. The two
17 are related, and the costs of margin drop when you
18 take into account a good capital regime. But,
19 once again, they are not the same. One is a
20 bottom-up approach to risk management; the other
21 is a top-down. And I think that one of the goals
22 of margining is to sort of build in from the

1 bottom up in the system of better habits of
2 looking ahead to possible risks and managing
3 possible risks from the moment that you start sign
4 up that transaction to get people to think about
5 the potential costs if the transaction goes south
6 on them.

7 And there are some other issues of
8 potential capital arbitrage. Those are affected
9 by Basel III, but I'm completely sure that Basel
10 III will seal all of those avenues, so -- but
11 that's another topic.

12 MR. TAFARA: Okay. Robert, then Sarah,
13 and then we'll see if Brian still has a question
14 left.

15 MR. REILLY: When Dan asked his question
16 about affiliates, he was looking at me, so I
17 wanted to be sure that I answered it.

18 Let me give you a hypothetical. It
19 certainly can simplify -- but consider a
20 FSA-regulated U.K. trading company that does not
21 do fiscal or financial business with any U.S.
22 counterparty other than its U.S. affiliate. Now,

1 you have the U.S. affiliate, and it does no
2 business outside the United States other than with
3 its affiliates, all right? They're Conway owned.
4 There's no systemic risk. So, what justifies all
5 additional cost related to clearing and margining
6 and all of the other administrative requirements?
7 Further, if the CFTC takes jurisdiction over the
8 U.K. entity, don't you expect that FSA will then
9 take jurisdiction over the U.S. entity? So, I
10 just question what benefits, sir.

11 MR. TAFARA: Sarah?

12 MS. LEE: Yeah, I was going back to
13 Robert's question on the global entity concept and
14 just talk from our perspective. I mean, ideally
15 we would like a global booking entity construct.
16 I mean, it's easier from a risk management
17 perspective. That's complicated for clients and
18 ultimately I think easier for regulators if the
19 risk is consolidated in one entity.

20 I think, you know, one of the things
21 that will -- there's a difference between where we
22 are today and where we would like to be. I think

1 one of the challenges here is that we need more
2 mutual recognition amongst countries, because if
3 you take, for example, Europe, in order to benefit
4 from passporting in Europe we have to book trades
5 when we trade with the European counterparties and
6 any E.U. affiliate. We can't have our U.S. bank
7 go into Europe. We'd have to go and get licenses.
8 Now, I know that Europe was working on a sort of
9 mutual recognition construct, and I think, to the
10 extent that regulators work towards harmonized
11 approaches and have mutual recognition, that will
12 basically incentivize people to have harmonized
13 regulation as well as allow entities like
14 ourselves to potentially have a global booking
15 entity that is based in the U.S. where our parent
16 is and be able to trade around the world in those
17 jurisdictions where there's mutual recognition.
18 At the moment, we as an institution have to book
19 our trades around lots of different companies
20 around the world due to the local licensing
21 requirements in those other regions. So, it will
22 help us a lot if the regulators work together to

1 work toward some sort of mutual recognition.

2 MR. BUSSEY: Sarah, to put a fine point
3 on that, that's not the case with your competitors
4 in Europe who are able to book transactions with
5 U.S. customers in Europe, is that right?

6 MS. LEE: You mean, that they have -- if
7 they're set up in Europe, then they've already got
8 an E.U. affiliate. But they don't -- when they
9 come and source the U.S., they don't have to use a
10 U.S. subsidiary.

11 MR. BUSSEY: That's right. In other
12 words, you're not able, because you're based in
13 the U.S., to run a single global booking entity,
14 but a European-based entity would be able to
15 because it's really the passporting in Europe
16 that's driving --

17 MS. LEE: Yes.

18 MR. BUSSEY: -- your need to be based in
19 Europe as well as in the United States.

20 MS. LEE: That is correct.

21 MR. TAFARA: Brian, do you have a
22 question?

1 MR. BUSSEY: I actually want to see if I
2 can bait somebody into a vociferous discussion
3 with Ananda on the branch issue. If -- five
4 minutes.

5 I guess does anyone want to take a
6 different view on whether we should be looking at
7 registering branches? And I know there's
8 authority under the definition to look at
9 activities' lines of business and call those
10 entities dealers, and if we do, how do we deal
11 with the capital and margin or capital, margin,
12 and other entity-level requirements when it's a
13 branch as opposed to the whole entity? And this
14 goes not only for, for example, your entity,
15 Marcelo, having a New York branch but also
16 U.S.-based entities having branches in other
17 countries.

18 MR. TAFARA: Marcelo raised his flag
19 before you even finished your question. And we'll
20 take some other answers and then I think Dan will
21 get the last question. We'll try to do this
22 quickly. Again, we only five minutes left, so,

1 Marcelo, why don't you go first.

2 MR. RIFFAUD: Okay, lamb to the
3 slaughter I guess.

4 So, the statute speaks to limited
5 designated and so contemplates actually something
6 much less juridical than even a branch. It
7 contemplates divisions. So, it contemplates an
8 activity-based approach where God knows how you
9 delineate the activity. On the other hand, when
10 you have a branch, while it is from a credit
11 perspective the same legal entity and all those
12 entity-wide rules will attach, it is also a
13 well-understood -- there's a well-understood
14 perimeter around that branch such that if the
15 statute already allows someone to come to you and
16 to register a division or something else, for them
17 to come and say hi, this is my New York branch, I
18 want to register as a swap dealer because I've got
19 a huge book already of swaps and I'm a dealer, I
20 don't see why that would not be sufficient for
21 your purposes when needing to ensure compliance.
22 All the rules that attach to Deutsche Bank, New

1 York Branch, that are about capital, about
2 prudential management -- all of those rules are
3 entity-level rules, and we're hoping that you find
4 the German regime to be comparable, right? It's
5 not that you're delegating and then losing or
6 assigning; you're just deferring. So, I view it
7 that way.

8 And then for the transaction-based
9 rules, you already have that, because when the New
10 York branch is speaking to a U.S. person or
11 trading with a U.S. person you have jurisdictional
12 role of that activity.

13 And this isn't a jurisdictional
14 question.

15 MR. TAFARA: Chris, why don't we let you
16 go, then since we're trying to engage Ananda, see
17 if he's got anything he wants to add to the point
18 he made earlier. And as I said we'll finish up
19 with Dan. So, Chris?

20 MR. ALLEN: Thank you. My point is
21 going to be very similar to Marcelo's, just to
22 articulate it, which I think you have to ask the

1 question -- one has to ask the question in
2 conjunction with, going back to the first question
3 of the panel, what is the consequence of that
4 registration? So, on one level logically the
5 notion of the registration of something which
6 doesn't have distinct legal form is clearly quite
7 conceptually challenging. But I think the
8 question naturally segues quickly into what does
9 that mean? Where does that take you in terms of
10 the conducts of business and/or prudential
11 regulations that might then apply?

12 And to go back to the point which I made
13 in answer to that first question of the panel,
14 which is I don't think it's incompatible with that
15 approach to say you would still -- of course as
16 soon as you have the U.S. nexus in terms of U.S.
17 person investor involvement -- have all of the
18 conducts of business rules applying to -- at the
19 transaction level to what the firm based in
20 London, for example, or elsewhere does. But that
21 doesn't necessarily require you, notwithstanding
22 that that entity is a registered swap dealer, to

1 then extend conducts of business obligations to
2 the business conducted between that entity in
3 London and a counterpart or client that it has in
4 France, Italy, or Spain and so on. So, I think
5 it's -- my point is I think you have to look at
6 potentially the consequences of registration in
7 conjunction with the notion of what it is that is
8 the registrant.

9 MR. TAFARA: Ananda, did you want to
10 react?

11 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yeah. I still can't
12 get that, because -- and maybe I'm being too much
13 of a lawyer. Who is the legal person? That's my
14 first question. Who is the legal person? The
15 legal -- the branch -- is there a legal person in
16 the United States, right? Which means that it's
17 the mother ship, which is the legal person, so
18 that's where I go -- or father ship, whatever it
19 is. I go there and say you must register.

20 It's different if you -- and then the
21 second question is where do I go -- where does the
22 CFTC send its staff to look for compliance? Now

1 then maybe, you know, we can go to the branch
2 office and say okay, you know, it's like how do we
3 regulate BD/FCMs, right? We know who to talk to,
4 to look for compliance with the CFTC world, right?
5 So, that's what I'm thinking about. I just cannot
6 get in -- this concept of registering a division
7 -- a division -- to me it's meaningless. It's not
8 a legal person.

9 MR. TURBEVILLE: Would it be helpful if
10 I read the phrase? Because I think you're right
11 completely and a thousand percent. It says, "A
12 person may be designated a swap dealer for a
13 single type or single class or category of swap
14 activities and considered not to be a swap dealer
15 for other types." So, it's a person that gets
16 registered. And what you're saying is that for a
17 class of activity, they fulfill the swap dealer
18 criteria, and for another class they may not, so
19 you may not require them to be a swap dealer for
20 that other class or you may. So, it's a person,
21 not a branch, and it's crystal clear, and I can't
22 understand what's in a lot of the comment letters

1 around this --

2 MR. BUSSEY: Wally, can't you read that?
3 It says, "suggest you register the person but it's
4 only with respect to the activities in the
5 branch"? I'm not a lawyer, but --

6 MR. TURBEVILLE: Yeah, but it is a
7 person -- you're not registering a branch, you're
8 registering a person and you may limit the
9 applicability of the registration requirements to
10 a silo of activities.

11 MR. TAFARA: So, now I'm going to turn
12 to general counsel with the CFTC for a legal
13 answer. (Laughter)

14 MR. BERKOVITZ: That was going to be my
15 question. But it was basically the same. There's
16 just two aspects to the question. One is can you
17 have a branch or can you have part -- partial
18 registration, and Wally's correctly read the
19 statute on it. But then my question was, was the
20 intent by doing that to not have the parent, not
21 have the main company -- which would be the
22 booking agent -- that they wouldn't register at

1 all? We would just defer? Or would it be they
2 would also register, but then in our application
3 of the requirements we say well, you're a
4 registrant but through comity or deference or
5 whatever we would not apply. I don't -- it wasn't
6 clear to me that the other side of that was that
7 the main booking entity would not be a registrant.
8 Or is that the goal, you just -- you want the
9 branch to be the registrant and the main booking
10 entity not to be the registrant at all, or it
11 would be okay to have the booking agent to be the
12 registrant, too, but the application not apply on
13 the reasons of deference or whatever?

14 MR. TAFARA: Angie, let me let Chris go
15 first and then I'll have you speak, okay?

16 MR. ALLEN: No, I was going to say I
17 think you captured exactly what I think would have
18 to be the approach, which is the notion that you
19 can register something which doesn't have legal
20 personality. Of course it's very difficult to
21 comprehend what does that really mean, but then
22 the better question which naturally flows is what

1 is the consequence of that registration and is it
2 a particular activity or series of activities
3 which might, for example, be defined by reference
4 to a more tightly defined U.S. nexus, which then
5 defines the consequences of that registration?

6 And I think that's -- the two questions have to
7 sit side by side. So, the point I was trying to
8 make just before -- I think it's clear, from the
9 point of view of who signs what piece of paper, it
10 has to be a legal entity level.

11 MR. TAFARA: Angie, it's your model that
12 started all of this, so it may be appropriate for
13 you to end.

14 MS. KARNA: It's my model, but I want to
15 reiterate that my model doesn't involve branches,
16 so this very interesting legal question is
17 actually not something that I spent a lot of time
18 on. However, if I think about dealing activity,
19 if I'm not -- if my foreign entity isn't
20 interacting with U.S. clients at all, if there is
21 always a registered U.S. swap dealer who is on the
22 hook for every single requirement of Dodd-Frank,

1 I'm not sure what the regulatory problem is with
2 that. I see the counter side. I see that one
3 could also require my foreign entity, because the
4 booking entity to register and then defer to all
5 of the entity-level requirements defer to the
6 foreign regulator and at the U.S. level have all
7 the transactional requirements. But backstage
8 challenging to have -- even though we say
9 "deferral," it's challenging in practice to talk
10 about an entity being regulated by two different
11 parts of the world. You know, and honestly I
12 haven't looked through it all, because it's hard
13 enough to talk to the JFSA or the FSA about
14 whether they would contemplate us registering that
15 entity in the United States of America. But I
16 think -- I see those two approaches, but I do
17 think that the regulators get what they need with
18 a fully -- with a substantial intermediary in the
19 United States of America who's registered, who's
20 completely on the hook.

21 MR. TAFARA: One thing I think needs to
22 be added to the statement you made, Angie, is that

1 for a number of us, we live in a world where you
2 do have dually regulated and dually registered
3 entities. And we make it work. It can be made to
4 work. That's not to say that the model you've put
5 forward is not something that's worth considering.
6 But I think it's not right to also come to the
7 conclusion that it would be impossible to live in
8 a world where you have an entity that is regulated
9 by two regulators. And granted they would have to
10 work collaboratively and you'd try to make things
11 work as smoothly as possible, but it's not in the
12 realm of the impossible. In fact, it's reality
13 for us with respect to a number of entities.

14 But I see that, Sarah, you've got your
15 flag up, and we are five minutes over, so you get
16 the last word.

17 MS. LEE: Well, I was just looking at it
18 from a different perspective, because we have our
19 bank, but then we have foreign branches outside
20 the U.S. that we use to transact business,
21 particularly in Asia.

22 Angie, I think to your question, we

1 would be registering the bank as a swaps dealer,
2 and so then that bank would be subject to the
3 entity-level requirements of capital prudential,
4 other prudential requirements, and credit risk
5 management. I think that the point that we'd like
6 to make is in relation to that foreign branch's
7 activities and the transactional-level
8 requirements only applying to transactions it does
9 with U.S. persons, not with its foreign clients.
10 That's really the perspective that we're looking
11 at it from.

12 MR. TAFARA: Sarah, I was wrong, you
13 don't get the last word. Chairman Gensler does,
14 so let me get out of the way.

15 MR. GENSLER: Mine's an easy one. I
16 just wanted to thank all of you. I think this is
17 the 14th roundtable we've had. No doubt we'll
18 have more roundtables. We've had hundreds of
19 meetings. I think we're approaching a thousand.
20 I don't know which one of you has the lead on it,
21 but somebody in the press will probably survey and
22 say who's got more meetings.

1 It's been enormously beneficial for -- I
2 can speak for the CFTC and all of my
3 Commissioners; I think it's probably true for the
4 SEC -- to have these roundtables. I know at the
5 heart of many of your dealings is this
6 international issue -- which transactions are in,
7 which entities are in, to the branch issues, and
8 so forth -- and I'm not here to address any of
9 them. I'm just here listening, and it's very
10 helpful, and I thank you.

11 We're going to seek further public
12 comment at the CFTC around these international
13 issues. I think you kind of know the team here.
14 Carl back here is our new team lead. I think the
15 SEC can speak on how they're seeking further
16 public comment. So, you'll be able to look at a
17 document and actually, you know, get your lawyers
18 and run up the, you know, send us your legal
19 briefs on it. But, you know, this is enormously
20 helpful.

21 The core of Dodd-Frank is about
22 protecting the American public and promoting

1 transparency in these markets and lowering risk.
2 Hopefully, that aligns with your interests.
3 Sometimes it won't, and, you know, that's what the
4 comment period's about.

5 But I just want to thank you again.

6 MR. TAFARA: Thank you, Chairman. We'll
7 break until 2:15 and resume at 2:15 in this room.
8 Thank you.

9 (Recess)

10 MS. MESA: Okay. Is everybody ready to
11 start with our final panel today?

12 I want to thank our third panel
13 participants for participating today and I'm going
14 to do what we've done with all the other panels.
15 If you could just go around the room and introduce
16 yourselves and your organizations, that would be
17 great.

18 Kim, I caught you -- do you want to
19 start and just introduce yourself and who you are
20 with?

21 MS. TAYLOR: Kim Taylor, CME Clearing
22 and also CME Group.

1 MR. SHORT: Jonathan Short,
2 Intercontinental Exchange.

3 MR. OLESKY: Lee Olesky, Tradeweb.

4 MR. TURBEVILLE: Wally Turbeville,
5 Better Markets.

6 MR. O'CONNOR: Steve O'Connor, Morgan
7 Stanley.

8 MR. AXILROD: I'm Pete Axilrod, DTCC.

9 MR. CAWLEY: James Cawley, Javelin
10 Capital Markets, also here for the SDMA.

11 MR. GRAULICH: Matthias Graulich, Eurex
12 Clearing.

13 MS. LEVINE: Iona Levine, LCH.

14 MS. MIMS: Verett Mims, Boeing.

15 MS. MESA: Thank you. Our first panels
16 this morning really addressed transactions and
17 swap dealers and major swap participants, and this
18 is our chance to learn more about global
19 infrastructures. And by that we mean
20 clearinghouses, repositories, exchanges, and
21 potential SEFs.

22 So the first question I'm just going to

1 turn it over to Ananda Radhakrishnan to lead off.

2 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Thank you, Jackie.

3 As people know, Dodd-Frank has a clearing
4 requirement and I admit it took me quite a while
5 to figure out what the requirement was. But
6 basically the requirement is that if the
7 Commission determines that a particular type or
8 class of swaps has to be cleared, in other words,
9 mandated to be cleared, then certain types of
10 people have to clear it. Specifically, swap
11 dealers, major swap participants, and those people
12 who come within the definition of a financial
13 entity. And the requirement is that you clear it
14 through a DCO that's registered with the
15 Commission or a clearinghouse that is exempted by
16 the Commission from registration if there is a
17 comparable regime.

18 So the question is -- as several of you
19 may know I personally am not in favor of giving
20 anybody a break so people have asked me, you know,
21 should we do this? And I said -- my answer is,
22 you know, well, no because we don't even know how

1 this whole clearing thing is going to work out.

2 Right? Number one. Number two, we have right now

3 two foreign located clearinghouses who are DCS.

4 Right? LCH and ICE Clear U.K., and we have an

5 application from CME Clearing Europe to be a DCO.

6 So in other words, if you are a clearinghouse

7 located outside, it's not difficult to become a

8 DCO. It's not easy but it's not difficult.

9 But having said that let's say that the

10 Commission is determined to recognize foreign

11 clearinghouses. How should we do that? What

12 should we be looking to determine that a regime is

13 comparable? And how should we tackle the specific

14 issue of letting people know, letting U.S. people

15 know that if they do clear through a non-DCO they

16 do not get the segregation protections of the

17 United States nor do they get bankruptcy

18 protection.

19 So the first question is what -- how do

20 we go about determining comparability? And two,

21 it's not a simple matter of giving somebody an

22 exemption. Other things flow from it. Right?

1 Because clearing is not done in isolation. People
2 have to clear through intermediaries so other
3 things flow from it. And you cannot represent
4 that you are segregating funds pursuant to the CEA
5 unless you are an FCM. Right? And at the
6 clearinghouse level you cannot represent that
7 unless you are a registered DCO. So if we give
8 somebody an exemption, how do we tell the whole
9 world if something goes wrong don't come looking
10 at me. That's basically what my question is.

11 MS. MESA: I notice that Ananda is
12 drinking Bob Marley's "Mellow Mood." I don't know
13 if one of you gave that to him but it hasn't
14 affected him yet. So we're going to let him keep
15 going until that sets in.

16 So I'm looking at the clearinghouses
17 specifically because this seems to be a
18 clearinghouse question. So I'm looking at Iona or
19 Kim or Jonathan. Do any of you want to take the
20 first -- the first hit at tackling Ananda's
21 question?

22 MR. SHORT: I'll jump in and just start

1 us off, Jackie.

2 Jonathan Short with Intercontinental
3 Exchange. We are one of the clearinghouses that
4 Ananda mentioned. We do have a foreign
5 clearinghouse, a recognized clearinghouse in
6 London, ICE Clear Europe that is also a DCO. So I
7 acknowledge what Ananda said. It is possible to
8 become a DCO and still have your primary
9 regulatory status in your home jurisdiction.

10 That said, I think where the challenge
11 comes in that would probably tip me in favor of
12 some sort of exemptive and mutual recognition
13 regime is that if you play that out across all of
14 the jurisdictions that might have an interest here
15 when you take into account where Europe may be
16 going in its regulation, things can get a lot more
17 complicated. You may be talking about more than
18 being a recognized clearinghouse in a DCO. You
19 may have other iterations that you have to comply
20 with and I think that some sort of mutual
21 recognition or exemptive relief is appropriate.

22 I do also think that Ananda is right in

1 that I think there are some assumptions that
2 people make about the protections that you get
3 from being a DCO. I personally think that that
4 should be addressed through disclosure. I mean,
5 if you have consenting parties that understand the
6 insolvency and bankruptcy regimes of the, you
7 know, of the country in question and the rules,
8 they should be permitted to have their positions
9 in clearinghouses that may not provide the last
10 level of protection that a DCO might provide.

11 MS. TAYLOR: I would agree with what
12 Jonathan is talking about about a mutual
13 recognition regime having some significant
14 benefits because there could be a
15 multijurisdictional impact and every time an
16 entity is required to directly adhere to even
17 slightly different sets of regulatory requirements
18 it becomes a complication. Certainly it can be
19 done but it becomes a complication. And one
20 aspect that I would hold out as a potential model
21 would be what the U.K. has done for a number of
22 years with its recognized overseas clearinghouse

1 and recognized overseas investment exchange
2 programs. CME has both of those statuses for our
3 U.S. entities and they were both highly reliant on
4 the FSA satisfying themselves that our home
5 country regime was comparable enough with the
6 regime in the U.K. that they allowed us to operate
7 in their jurisdiction with the same kind of
8 bankruptcy protection as a local clearinghouse but
9 without having to explicitly meet all of their
10 express requirements. And it seems like something
11 like that would be a model for the regulators to
12 work collectively toward in the future. It would
13 have been preferable from our point of view if
14 that would have extended beyond the U.K. into
15 other, you know, other parts of the European
16 Union. So something that would be broader I think
17 would be more preferable.

18 MS. LEVINE: I think the answer might be
19 slightly more complicated than that. We're a DCO
20 and obviously we're sort of in the U.K. as well
21 and we haven't to date found any problems at all
22 whatsoever with the current system. Now, we feel

1 incredibly comfortable with the current system and
2 I think perhaps this will come out of the
3 questions slightly later on. Where could it go
4 wrong? And once we're completely comfortable with
5 the current system, what we're worried about going
6 forward -- and I don't want to go into details now
7 because I'm sure it's another question -- is any
8 sort of inconsistencies between the sort of number
9 of regimes that you have to actually comply with.
10 And I can see very good reasons why one would want
11 to continue to be a DCO here if in fact one was
12 offering client clearing.

13 And perhaps the trick is to look at this
14 slightly differently. The trick is to say, what
15 is it that's being cleared? Is it just interbank
16 clearing? And if you're doing a minute amount of
17 interbank clearing, do you need to be really
18 regulated? Or is it in fact customer clearing
19 that you're looking at? And so we took a decision
20 that basically we want to be able to give U.S.
21 customers U.S. protections. We didn't want there
22 to be any confusion about this so we've completely

1 embraced the whole sort of U.S. client segregation
2 and we think that that's very good. What we don't
3 want to be banned from doing though, is to be able
4 to offer different kinds of segregation in
5 different jurisdictions.

6 And this probably comes onto something
7 slightly later. Say for example if one kind of
8 client protection was available in Europe, we'd
9 want to be able to offer that to European clients.
10 If the Japanese decided to do something different
11 for their clients, we want to be able to offer
12 that. And we want to also be able to offer U.S.-
13 client segregation in a way in which the U.S.
14 finally determines that they want to do it.

15 MR. GRAULICH: Well, from my perspective
16 recognition (inaudible) clearinghouses is a very
17 important aspect. And I'm not looking only at the
18 relationship between the U.S. and Europe as Eurex
19 is Europe-domiciled. I mean, if you look at the
20 G-20 -- so we're talking about 20 countries, all
21 are setting up their rules. If you now look at
22 the U.S. approach, if you say a U.S. transaction

1 involving a U.S. client needs to be cleared by a
2 DCO. If the Japanese say, well, if a Japanese
3 client is to be cleared by a clearinghouse
4 registered in Japan, and if you go around the
5 world we as a clearinghouse are regulated by 15,
6 20 regulators globally. I don't say that it's not
7 possible but it is very inefficient.

8 And if you look, there are already rules
9 existing like the CPSS-IOSCO recommendations for
10 CCPs which are of global nature. So I think we
11 need to have an international recognition
12 framework based on, for example, CPSS-IOSCO
13 recommendations to allow clearinghouses a
14 simplified process to be recognized in foreign
15 countries and also from an auditing perspective
16 that while the practices of the local regulator
17 are to some degree acknowledge by the foreign
18 regulatory authorities.

19 MS. MIMS: Well, as a non-clearinghouse
20 user I think the one thing you have to keep in
21 mind is netting agreements. In the sense that we
22 don't have mutual agreements out there, what will

1 happen is I only have to increase the amount of
2 collateral I'm going to put up because I'm not --
3 if a foreign clearinghouse isn't recognizing a
4 U.S.-based, you know, subsidiary outside the
5 country then I have to put up even more money.
6 And so right now as I agree with them it's
7 relatively efficient if people are having to clear
8 in Japan and Australia. But I think part of the
9 problem is you can't say to yourselves or U.S.
10 corporate, most of them are used to netting out
11 those transactions. And if they have multiple
12 exchange now with multiple regulations then it's
13 going to be really difficult. To their point not
14 impossible but more difficult and more costly.

15 MS. MESA: I'm going to allow Ananda
16 just to follow up on his question if he has it and
17 then I have a follow-up as well.

18 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yeah. So I think
19 Matthias is suggesting that what we could do if we
20 went down this route was to look at compliance
21 with the CPSS-IOSCO standards because that, you
22 know, as all of you know, the Dodd-Frank Act

1 basically codified the current version of the
2 CPSS-IOSCO standards. And in our rulemakings
3 we're trying to be as consistent with the latest
4 draft which (inaudible) for public consultation.

5 But the other question I want to ask is
6 should the Commission condition it on reciprocity,
7 number one? And number two, can we do it legally
8 given the number of trade agreements that the
9 United States has signed? So I guess it would be
10 rather unfortunate if the CFTC and/or the SEC were
11 the only two regulators who had such a program and
12 nobody else did.

13 MS. MESA: By the way, if you want to
14 speak, please put up your placard and then I can
15 call you in order. But I see Kim wants to say
16 something so go ahead.

17 MS. TAYLOR: Personally I think from our
18 point of view the reciprocity, the mutuality of
19 the arrangement would be important because I think
20 we would want to be able to be assured that if
21 competitors were able to easily enter our
22 jurisdiction that we would be equally easily able

1 to enter other jurisdictions. So I think that
2 that would be an important feature.

3 I think though it's perhaps a little bit
4 off the topic of your original question but I
5 think one of the points that Matthias was making
6 was I think very important. There's actually an
7 aspect of the whole thing that I think produces an
8 extra layer of complexity and that is the tendency
9 that is being shown right now in the rulemaking at
10 various stages an various places of requiring that
11 certain types of parties have to clear in certain
12 places. And I think that particularly in the
13 over-the-counter swaps arena the customers have a
14 certain level of sophistication just by being able
15 to be participants in that market. And I think
16 that it is creating an artificial set of
17 requirements to require certain types of
18 transactions by certain types of parties to clear
19 in certain jurisdictions. So that would be
20 something that I would also encourage us to think
21 long and hard about doing.

22 MS. MESA: Wally.

1 MR. TURBEVILLE: A couple of things to
2 keep in mind is it will be a new world and
3 clearing as a concept has become really central to
4 the Dodd-Frank structure. And along with that I
5 think people's faith in clearing is heightened as
6 well. And clearing can be thought of as a panacea
7 for many kinds of risks. And so the concern is
8 that while certainly operationally to make things
9 as efficient as possible, the notion of
10 substantive inquiry into not only the rules but
11 the performance under the rules and the level of
12 enforcement by regulators in another jurisdiction
13 is quite important.

14 One of the things that we get concerned
15 about is the potential for the interconnectedness
16 of clearing and how you could imagine a situation
17 where a clearinghouse might run into trouble and
18 that could infect other clearinghouses and the
19 faith in other clearinghouses which would be
20 problematic. So the point being in substance
21 there really does have to be a certain level of
22 meaning to what clearing is and certain basic

1 standards have to be fulfilled. And certainly
2 disclosures have to be complete. So that's -- I
3 think we do look at the situation now as being
4 with clearing so much more pervasive, the whole
5 question of interconnectedness is very important
6 in making sure certain standards are maintained.

7 MS. MESA: One last comment on this.
8 James.

9 MR. CAWLEY: If -- Javelin is an
10 electronic swaps execution venue that expects to
11 file as a SEF once the rules have been finalized.
12 For us, one of the key things you've got to look
13 at when it comes to foreign entities trading here
14 or clearing here is that they comply with all the
15 provisions of the act. And where we sit,
16 specifically we focus a lot in our interaction
17 with clearinghouses, especially when it comes to
18 access. And that they allow SEFs to connect in
19 and to launch all on the same day. And we haven't
20 seen that. We've seen it from the CME. We're
21 negotiating with ICE right now. And frankly, you
22 know, not to put anyone on the spot but LCH told

1 us that they're going to launch with Bloomberg and
2 Tradeweb before they launch with us.

3 So, you know, these are the issues that
4 we focus on. If you're going to open for business
5 on one day, let's all open on the same day and
6 let's not show favoritism to one execution venue
7 or the other. I thought I might kick off with
8 that.

9 MS. LEVINE: Guys --

10 MS. MESA: Before this just shifts into
11 access, why don't you Iona, have the chance to go
12 back to James about this comment and then we'll
13 continue on some of the clearing questions. Go
14 ahead, Iona.

15 MS. LEVINE: Okay. I'm not sure this is
16 quite the right form for who said what to who and
17 whose e-mail was whatever. Anyway, look, what I
18 would say is that a clearinghouse would be crazy
19 not to want to have every SEF that was
20 operationally -- and I won't use the word
21 competent as sort of a slur on anybody. I would
22 just say the word competent is a sort of base

1 level assuming, you know, that it is and not
2 making any sort of aspersions to anybody. We
3 would want everybody to connect to us. We think
4 that everybody should be mandated to connect to us
5 because that's where we get our business from.

6 I cannot speak to why people are having
7 some sort of sideways spat on who is the first one
8 that could test. We're not talking about
9 connecting; we're talking about running a pilot
10 program within API. And I cannot believe that a
11 clearinghouse can be mandated to run a pilot
12 program with absolutely everybody on the planet to
13 see if they can connect first off. I think that
14 Dodd-Frank is not trying to micromanage everybody
15 to say that in fact, you know, LCH has to allow, I
16 don't know, 20 SEFs, 30 SEFs, some of whom are not
17 ready, some of whom are ready, to test something.
18 LCH simply doesn't have the resources, nor does
19 anybody. You should be able to test with one or
20 two that seem readier, provided that when the day
21 comes you've tested with them and your API is open
22 to everybody. I think you'll go back and find

1 that that's the subject of the e-mails. But look,
2 I think this is enough of a spat.

3 MR. CAWLEY: If I may respond.

4 MS. MESA: Wait, wait, wait. One last
5 response.

6 MR. CAWLEY: Okay.

7 MS. MESA: And then we might come back
8 as we address some SEF and open access issues.

9 MR. CAWLEY: So we don't see these
10 issues with domestic clearinghouse. We've
11 connected into the CME for months and we've been
12 operationally ready there for months. We do have
13 issue with foreign entities that come in and
14 expect to do business in this country and look for
15 reasons to circumvent some of the issues.

16 So not to put LCH, you know, on the
17 spot. But the practical reality is that we've
18 been waiting to connect in for months now and it
19 shouldn't take us two months to negotiate an NDA.

20 MS. LEVINE: It's very interesting.
21 Before I came here I said -- I never sat on one of
22 these panels. I said what's it like? Is it like,

1 you know, in the Roman amphitheater where they
2 throw you to the lions if you get the answers
3 wrong? And I was assured no, no. It's far more
4 charming than that and people are just interested
5 in the answers.

6 MS. MESA: We just let the lions eat
7 each other.

8 MS. LEVINE: Somebody wrongly briefed
9 me. Listen, one, I take real exception to being
10 called a foreign entity, okay, because I'm not a
11 foreign entity. I'm a DCO. Okay? I don't like
12 being called a foreign entity. But apart from
13 that, why don't we go and have a coffee and sort
14 this out?

15 MR. CAWLEY: Fair enough.

16 MS. MESA: Okay, good. Well, if we keep
17 having more of those you've kind of let the
18 moderators off the hook with conversations. But
19 Wally, did you want to say something on this issue
20 or something new?

21 MR. TURBEVILLE: Sort of new.

22 MS. MESA: Go ahead.

1 MR. TURBEVILLE: In terms of making this
2 a teaching moment, the -- I guess what we've
3 discovered here -- I didn't get any of the
4 e-mails. But what we've discovered here is that
5 there are other issues. Right? Which not only is
6 Dodd-Frank about creditworthiness and making sure
7 there are standards, there are also access issues.
8 So I think the significant issue, significant
9 point here is that the whole notion of looking to
10 exemption and looking to other ways to broaden
11 different forms of the infrastructure and how they
12 all work, those sorts of issues are unfortunately,
13 I think, it sounds like they're sort of in your
14 court as well. It's not just pure credit but
15 other kinds of issues that are reflective of what
16 Dodd-Frank wants to achieve in terms of a market
17 structure.

18 MS. MESA: I want to pick up on this
19 thought of recognition because it's something that
20 none of the panelists have mentioned yet. It came
21 back earlier. But regarding clearinghouses and
22 SEFs where we do have the ability to recognize,

1 right now there is nothing to recognize to. There
2 is no law in place in other parts of the world.
3 So what do the panelists suggest regarding this
4 timing issue?

5 MR. GRAULICH: Well, I think we have to
6 distinguish. I mean, if we look at, for example,
7 SEFs or trade repositories, this is pretty new to
8 the marketplace. And rules are drafted all around
9 the world now. If we talk about clearinghouses,
10 clearinghouses have been around for many years.
11 There is regulatory oversight for almost -- well,
12 many clearinghouses around the globe since many
13 years, there are standard rules and I think these
14 standard rules are all around proper margin
15 regimes, risk models, stress testing, back
16 testing, access requirements. So all these rules
17 are there since many years. So I think even the
18 fact that the swaps regulation or the clearing
19 obligations in different stages around the world
20 shouldn't be an argument to say we have to wait
21 until everything in this particular area is ready
22 because clearinghouses are there and

1 clearinghouses have their regime and everything.
2 So I think that should be taken into consideration
3 as it is little different to other elements of
4 this new world.

5 MS. MESA: Pete and then Lee.

6 MR. AXILROD: I was just going to make a
7 general comment that -- I've now lost my train of
8 thought. Why don't we go to Lee and then Pete.

9 MS. MESA: Lee, are you ready?

10 MR. OLESKY: Yes, thanks. I think the
11 question is what do we do in this interim period
12 before the rules are exactly clear? I can't speak
13 for clearing corps. I can speak for electronic
14 trading venues and hopefully those that intend to
15 become SEFs.

16 We've been in the business of trading
17 electronically for 12 years. We've traded
18 derivative instruments for five years. We trade
19 250 to 300 billion per day among institutions
20 around the world with 50 banks and 2,000
21 institutions and all the World Central Banks.
22 Given that, I guess the message I would like to

1 send is I think we should be encouraging more
2 activity to happen on electronic venues that
3 afford all the policy objectives that Dodd-Frank
4 was about in terms of enhanced transparency,
5 easier access, more efficient markets, and a safer
6 environment.

7 So in this interim period, while you
8 have businesses that have taken advantage of
9 technology over the last 12 to 15 years and
10 started to connect people up electronically -- and
11 it's not just Tradeweb, there's plenty of others,
12 Bloomberg, etcetera -- I think we should be
13 encouraging that kind of activity because it's
14 ultimately serving the same policy objectives that
15 the law was set out to do.

16 And not to discourage that kind of
17 activity. I think the good news is -- I can speak
18 for Tradeweb and I'm sure it's the same with many
19 other market participants -- our derivative
20 activity has more than doubled in the last year.
21 Very simply put, they're doing it. The customers
22 are doing it -- the institutions and dealers --

1 with an expectation of rules that will come into
2 play. And they're preparing themselves for it and
3 they're preparing for this new environment, which
4 by the way they would have been doing anyhow and
5 they have been doing for the last 12 to 15 years.
6 It's just going to happen at a faster pace now.
7 So I would say anything that kind of encourages
8 more of that activity is a good thing from a
9 policy standpoint.

10 Obviously, we're very interested in
11 seeing what the final rules are and developing the
12 technology and the response to the rules so that
13 we meet all of the criteria. And the sooner that
14 happens, the better from our perspective. But in
15 this interim period I think we should be
16 encouraging all market participants to be
17 following this path that's been laid out within
18 the law which is transparency. It's not per se
19 electronic trading but transparency, greater
20 efficiency, capturing data, which allows for, you
21 know, a better review of the marketplace in times
22 of stress.

1 MS. MESA: On the question on
2 recognition and timing, Pete, you're up with that.

3 MR. AXILROD: Okay. I remembered now.
4 I mean, essentially everybody is sort of
5 addressing the recognition issue as, you know,
6 there are a lot of jurisdictions who are
7 interested in what I do. So who is going to be
8 the regulator? We've operated for many years with
9 multiple regulators, some of our entities. And I
10 can guarantee you that most of the trade
11 repositories that are going to apply for
12 registration as an SDR are going to carry another
13 regulator with them for one reason or another.
14 We've got a regulated repository, a supervised
15 repository today that's based in New York. It's
16 primarily supervised by the Federal Reserve Bank
17 of New York and the New York State Banking
18 Department. We've got another one in London that
19 is primarily supervised by the FSA. I guess I've
20 got a question for the panel. It's quite likely
21 that these are the entities we are going to come
22 in and try to register as SDRs. So are you going

1 to make us shed our current regulation? Are you
2 happy to regulate with these people? How is this
3 going to work?

4 MS. MESA: I don't think we can tell
5 another regulator to just leave because we have an
6 interest. So I don't think that's our right. We
7 can express an interest and regulate you but we
8 can't force somebody else to get out of your
9 business if they require you to also be
10 registered. So I don't know if that was your
11 question but that's --

12 MR. AXILROD: I guess it sounds like
13 you're happy to live in a world where there are
14 multiple supervisors of the same infrastructure.

15 MS. MESA: I think what we said earlier
16 is we recognize that there are issues and that's
17 why we're trying to coordinate to the maximum
18 extent possible so that, you know, we don't create
19 sort of multiple conflicts for you but in the
20 situation where we are going to regulate I think
21 we can work with the other regulators as well.
22 And you already said you're regulated by multiple

1 people as it is and you're still around.

2 MR. AXILROD: Yeah, as opposed to the
3 other, I guess repositories are a little
4 different. We don't mind having many regulators
5 because in effect the world works like that today.
6 We're responsible to many regulators.

7 MR. BUSSEY: Jackie, I'm one of the
8 regulators of DTC affiliates and we actually find
9 that it helps to have multiple perspectives
10 brought to bear on important infrastructures like
11 clearinghouses. So we regulate with the Fed and
12 with the New York State Banking Authority and we
13 find that to be actually helpful. Market
14 regulators bring different perspectives to the
15 table as opposed to prudential regulators. We
16 think it's a good combination. So we have
17 experience with it and we're going to have a lot
18 more in the new Dodd-Frank world.

19 MS. MESA: Kim.

20 MS. TAYLOR: You know, I was going to
21 speak to the recognition issues. Do you still
22 want to talk about that?

1 MS. MESA: Please, yes.

2 MS. TAYLOR: I guess I would suggest --
3 I would agree with -- I think it was Matthias that
4 said you don't really need to have the regulations
5 fully in place in other places in order to have
6 recognition. I would suggest that probably you
7 already have a number of things where you have
8 agreements with other regulators -- you already
9 have a sense of where you've got comparability of
10 regimes and I would suggest that maybe you use
11 that as a baseline. Certainly with
12 over-the-counter swaps you need to make sure that
13 there is kind of a legal enforceability of a
14 cleared transaction in that product set in the
15 jurisdiction. And beyond that a lot of the things
16 would be just the same basic things that you would
17 look at in evaluating any clearinghouse -- risk
18 management, bankruptcy, clarity, customer
19 protection. Is their disclosure -- I don't think
20 it would be necessary that the regs would be fully
21 implemented in other jurisdictions before you
22 would be able to do it.

1 MS. MESA: Lee.

2 MR. OLESKY: Yeah, I agree with that. I
3 mean, I can only sort of speak for the SEF side of
4 the world but I think it's a situation where if
5 you think they're heading in the same -- with the
6 same policy objectives and the same sort of
7 critical things as it relates to the execution
8 side, are these going to be regulated entities?
9 You know, as you said, is this going to be
10 required to be cleared centrally? Is there going
11 to be the same transparency elements that we
12 expect to see out of Dodd-Frank? Is there going
13 to be a central repository? I think if you check
14 on those four or five key points and you see
15 that's the direction, that's the right answer.
16 And then ultimately in terms of once the rules are
17 out on all sides of the Atlantic, then you can
18 make determinations in terms of reciprocity or
19 exemptive decisions or customers to do business as
20 you've done with futures exchanges and other types
21 of entities.

22 MS. MESA: Jonathan and then Ethiopis.

1 MR. SHORT: I just wanted to go back to
2 swap data repositories for a moment and talk about
3 what we found to be one interesting part of that
4 statute. And that is the obligation of an SDR to
5 obtain an indemnity from a foreign regulator if
6 you're going to share information. I never
7 understood why that was in the statute and I
8 scratch my head as to how I'm going to approach
9 the foreign regulator and ask for an indemnity
10 which I can pretty much guarantee you what the
11 response is going to be. But does that suggest
12 that we're going to be SDRs that are regulated
13 everywhere and that's the way we get around this
14 indemnity issue? We share the information with
15 them directly and it's everybody's information?

16 MS. MESA: The CFTC and the SEC have
17 been working on this issue. We know it's
18 problematic. We know it is not the goal to keep
19 information from regulators that need it. So we
20 recognize the issue that the indemnity clause
21 brings.

22 That said, I think there are a couple of

1 ways for regulators to get the information.
2 Foreign regulators. One is through the normal
3 channels, which is through the regulator. And so
4 if the CFTC or SEC directly regulates the
5 repository and the foreign regulator needs the
6 information they can come to us -- for an express
7 regulatory purpose and get the information. And
8 then second, if separately regulated by that
9 foreign regulator in their own right, they can
10 access the information without the indemnity.

11 Pete, did you want to say something on
12 that?

13 MR. AXILROD: Well, we all know that the
14 indemnity provision is an issue. I very much like
15 the idea that if there are multiple regulators,
16 each regulator gets to see it without an
17 indemnity. So I guess I would urge the
18 Commissions -- I know you've got your own lawyers
19 but if you can see your way clear to a solution
20 like that I think it would make everybody happy.

21 The other thing is, of course, that
22 we've had a lot of discussions with regulators

1 that wanted access to the data we currently have.
2 And it was fairly clear as it would be to the U.S.
3 regulators that nobody wants to have to ask
4 another regulator for the data. Right now there
5 are 30 regulators around the world that have
6 automatic sort of online access to our data. They
7 like that. That means they don't have to ask.
8 People don't have to know what they're
9 investigating. All that sort of thing.

10 So I'm hoping that we can get towards a
11 conclusion that doesn't require one regulator
12 asking permission of anybody to get data that
13 today they can get without asking permission.

14 MS. MESA: And you, Kim.

15 MS. TAYLOR: We seem to have moved onto
16 the SDR topic.

17 MS. MESA: It's running away from us.

18 MS. TAYLOR: One of the aspects of the
19 SDR topic that I wanted to be sure that we talked
20 about was the sense that I have that
21 clearinghouses are going to function as natural
22 SDRs for the transactions that they clear. And I

1 think that it will be fairly quickly if clearing
2 adoption goes, you know, according to the mandate
3 certainly or if there are mandates that emerge in
4 other jurisdictions as well. I think very soon
5 there will be an abundance of transactions that
6 are cleared and I think that I would caution us
7 from developing a market structure that requires
8 that an additional third party be a part of every
9 transaction because I think at some point once
10 clearing is adopted it will become almost an
11 unnecessary additional cost and operational burden
12 for all cleared transactions to be reported also
13 to another third party.

14 And what I'm wondering is if there's an
15 opportunity to use as somewhat of a model the
16 CFTC's large trader reporting system which allows
17 a regulator to take a standard format, input
18 format from a variety of different sources. Think
19 of it as a variety of SDRs in this case as opposed
20 to a variety of markets. And accumulate that
21 information and be able to use it either on a
22 routine basis for its own purposes or use it on an

1 ad hock basis for its own purposes. I'm somewhat
2 concerned about creating a market structure that
3 requires kind of duplicative reporting of all
4 transactions. Certainly, the uncleared
5 transactions -- not all clearinghouses may decide
6 to become a SDR for those transactions if that's
7 allowed. I think there's a little bit of a gray
8 area there but I would encourage us not to create
9 an infrastructure that requires duplicative
10 processing of all the cleared transactions.

11 MS. MESA: Pete.

12 MR. AXILROD: Yeah, I guess I would take
13 very strong issue with Kim's characterization of
14 duplicative reporting. In fact, that is -- the
15 structure Kim is suggesting is likely to end up
16 with inaccurate reporting to the regulators and
17 difficulty for the market participants who have
18 the ultimate reporting obligation under
19 Dodd-Frank. As you heard this morning, the market
20 participants, the ones with the ultimate reporting
21 obligation, really want one point of control. Not
22 that there has to be one repository but they want

1 to pick one place as a point of control for their
2 reporting obligations. And to relate this back to
3 international provisions, most of these firms will
4 have reporting obligations in multiple
5 jurisdictions that they have to manage. The only
6 way the firms that I've talked with have seemed to
7 be able to manage these reporting obligations is
8 to have a single point of control. And if they so
9 choose to have a single repository for reporting
10 of all of their transactions, it doesn't seem to
11 me that the regulators should mandate otherwise
12 because that's the way they think they can best
13 control the information falling in. Furthermore,
14 I guess I would say that it doesn't have to be
15 duplicative reporting if the DCOs would report to
16 the repositories at the request of our mutual
17 clients.

18 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: So what if it
19 transpired that in order for a DCO to be an SDR it
20 must also accept reports on uncleared
21 transactions? Were you suggesting, Kim, that you
22 would only be the SDR for cleared transactions or

1 would you be willing to do uncleared? If the
2 Commission said you've got to do both would you be
3 willing to do both?

4 MS. TAYLOR: If it turned out that we
5 had to do both my expectation is that we probably
6 would if we found that our clients valued that
7 service. I think my point really was that
8 clearinghouse is a natural automatic SDR for the
9 transactions that it clears. And for those
10 transactions I would hate for there to be a
11 mandate, a regulatory mandate that they also be
12 reported somewhere else if the clients choose to.
13 I'm not suggesting that there be a mandate that
14 the clients aren't allowed to report their
15 transactions someplace else; I'm just suggesting
16 that there should not be a mandate that requires
17 clients to use an additional service that I think
18 over time will end up being more duplicative than
19 that.

20 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: But then if you all
21 or ICE or LCH say, look, you know, we want to be
22 an SDR and if people choose to report uncleared

1 transactions to us we'll be happy to accept them,
2 that's fine with you guys?

3 MS. TAYLOR: I mean, I can't speak for
4 ICE or LCH but certainly that would be something
5 that we would consider doing.

6 MR. SHORT: For ICE, yes.

7 MS. LEVINE: Yes, we would as well.

8 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: So what are the SDRs
9 -- sorry, what do the SEFs think about this?
10 Those of you who may want to be SEFs?

11 MR. CAWLEY: From the SEF standpoint I
12 think, you know, Kim is certainly correct. I
13 think it's a good idea that you have -- you don't
14 want to have unnecessary duplication throughout
15 the system. And today while there's not a lot of
16 transparency in prices we crave this reporting
17 function. I think over time you're going to --
18 the importance of it is going to decay over time
19 as the market becomes more and more transparent.

20 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Sorry, in terms of
21 what?

22 MR. CAWLEY: In terms of the information

1 in terms of the hunger for the information because
2 right now we don't have that information. But it
3 should be come fairly ubiquitous if this thing
4 works. Right?

5 So from the SEF standpoint, you know,
6 SEFs under the rules that you've written are also
7 required to report trades. And from where we sit
8 from Javelin, we're certainly willing to work with
9 clearinghouses and also in terms of reporting that
10 information because we're the point of execution.
11 Likewise, we're also happy to pick up information
12 on trades that haven't been executed on our
13 platform. So it's a catchall because if we have
14 that plumbing to -- be it CCPs or indeed
15 regulators, we should be able to use it and profit
16 from it to collect other data and to make that
17 data more valuable both to regulators and to the
18 market as a whole.

19 MS. MESA: Ethiopis, did you want to
20 interject something here?

21 MR. TAFARA: Stir things up a little bit
22 maybe and play devil's advocate vis-à-vis what Kim

1 was saying.

2 Don't we run the risk without mandating
3 a central third party location for the data that
4 we'll get data fragmentation? Data fragmentation
5 that's not in the interest of systemic risk
6 management or risk management generally?

7 MS. TAYLOR: I mean, what I would
8 suggest is that if a party decided that they were
9 going to SDR their cleared trades wherever they
10 cleared them, and SDR their uncleared trades
11 wherever they chose -- could be one of the
12 clearinghouses they participate in; it could be a
13 separate third party -- that there would not be --
14 the parties would need to make sure that they are
15 not duplicate reporting. I agree with that. But
16 then all you need is a standard kind of mechanism
17 for regulators or interested parties to be able to
18 pull data out or for the entities acting as SDRs
19 to be able to deliver data to that central
20 repository. And I know that a mechanism like this
21 -- that this can work because I really think it is
22 very similar to the type of mechanism that the

1 CFTC has long had in place with reporting of the
2 large trader positions. They're reported by the
3 individual market participants and actually their
4 dealers tend to report them for them. Reported to
5 different markets who then pass through the
6 information in the standard format to the CFTC.
7 So the markets get to use the same information for
8 market surveillance. It's passed through to the
9 CFTC for its own market surveillance and its own
10 risk management across the broad industry. And
11 it's done very effectively on a daily basis with a
12 single reported -- a single reporting act and a
13 single reporting format by market participants.
14 So it's very efficient.

15 MR. TAFARA: But if my recognition
16 serves, there is no public dissemination of that.
17 Right? I mean, this is not consolidated
18 information.

19 MS. MESA: But it is aggregated by the
20 CFTC at the end of the week. I mean, I think one
21 thing I was just going to follow on what Ethiopis
22 was saying is that I think the burden shifts. The

1 burden then is on the regulator to sort of
2 aggregate and assess rather than what the goal was
3 from the repositories I think was somebody who
4 would just shovel this aggregated information to
5 -- in whatever form to the regulator. I mean, I
6 think it just shifts the burden perhaps is what
7 you're talking about.

8 MR. CAWLEY: If I could --

9 MS. MESA: Let's go in order. Let's
10 see. I think you all -- all ahead, Lee.

11 MR. OLESKY: I just wanted to respond to
12 Ananda's question about what the SEFs would think
13 about it and then get to your two points. I think
14 there are two different policy goals out of what
15 we're talking about. One is to give the
16 regulators a place to go to where they can look at
17 a view of the market in a consolidated way and
18 assess what's happening. And that is a unique
19 goal that's not necessarily a transparency goal
20 per se but an observing the market goal. And I
21 think that that is best served by things being in
22 one place. Given the complexity of these markets,

1 you know, aggregating it from a bunch of different
2 places I'm sure can be accomplished but I think
3 there are some questions about how that would all
4 come together. And technically anything can be
5 done. That can be done. The question is what
6 does it look like? And I think it does shift the
7 burden to the regulators to really then have that
8 element under control which is this aggregation.

9 The second objective I think out of
10 these types of entities is transparency, which is
11 price transparency to the public. And that's one
12 where I think competition is a good thing. I
13 think it's a good thing to allow anyone to do
14 this, to allow anyone to commercialize this data,
15 and more importantly, to have a requirement to get
16 the data out which is part of the whole rule set
17 to get it out within a specific period of time.
18 And I think once it's out in the public
19 environment there's going to be all sorts of
20 commercial interests that are going to come in and
21 try and aggregate that information, capture that
22 information, disseminate that information, and

1 make it commercially viable and acceptable and
2 usable by the marketplace.

3 So I think there are two different
4 objectives in my mind between these two things and
5 the one that would concern me is given the
6 complexity of the derivative markets and the
7 number of different instruments, you know, to put
8 that on the shoulders of the regulators to
9 reaggregate so that it works I think would be a
10 challenge across all asset classes. I mean, it
11 gets complicated.

12 MS. MESA: I don't know who was first
13 but Steve and then Wally.

14 MR. O'CONNOR: Yes. I think I would
15 agree with Lee there. It's important to make the
16 distinction between public reporting and
17 regulatory reporting. And I think the SDRs are
18 the regulatory reporting. And I imagine that SDRs
19 are a giant spreadsheet that allows you guys to
20 sort by any column that you want to to pick up the
21 next AIG or long-term capital or whatever. And to
22 have a system where you have multiple versions of

1 that spreadsheet that need to be aggregated
2 presents an enormous challenge I think.

3 MR. TURBEVILLE: I believe that
4 fragmentation is the issue, not difficulty
5 reporting. And I think fragmentation is
6 potentially a behemoth issue. And a concern is
7 that there is sort of -- there will be an
8 electronic swap data Tower of Babel running around
9 and anyone sort of silo of the information is
10 potentially volatile and damaging in itself. In
11 other words, the only way to truly understand the
12 market is to understand the market and the
13 relationships between all of these things. There
14 is -- there would be a great burden on the
15 regulators at this point. We had hoped months ago
16 that the regulators would have the capacity in
17 terms of budget and all the rest to actually do
18 the proper aggregation of the data and make sense
19 of it. That may or may not be the case now but
20 one thing that we have stressed in our comment
21 letters relating to SDRs is that as SDRs are
22 registered that a part of that is -- one way to

1 make the data more usable and more aggregatable is
2 if all of the information as it comes from the SDR
3 is in a format and style that allows you to do
4 that more easily. Right. Instead of having
5 multiple spreadsheets that somehow have to get
6 pushed together, to have some kind of a
7 standardized language as it comes from the SDR.
8 In other words, they're writing to your API as
9 opposed to you having to take down all of the
10 different forms of language and make it a common
11 language.

12 MR. O'CONNOR: Yeah. So then you're
13 into the SDR of SDRs, which itself is a new
14 behemoth that I don't think you guys should be
15 running.

16 MS. MESA: Understood. Who was next?
17 Mathias.

18 MR. GRAULICH: Well, perhaps I am
19 mistaken but there is no requirement for one
20 global TR. Right? So there will be multiple TRs
21 globally and also under your jurisdiction. So the
22 effort for the regulators to aggregate information

1 will be there in any way. So the key question is
2 or, well, what I think would simplify this whole
3 process is that there is a standardized plummet
4 making it much easier for the regulator to collect
5 the data and aggregate the data from the different
6 trade repositories. Therefore, and I agree with
7 what Kim said, I wouldn't see a big additional
8 effort if clearinghouses would act also as a trade
9 repository for clear transactions because it is
10 the natural home. All information is there. It's
11 just unnecessary and duplicative work if it is
12 additional transmitted to a trade repository where
13 the same data is then made available.

14 MS. MESA: Okay. Go ahead.

15 MR. CAWLEY: Yeah. I would say that,
16 you know, one of the things you have to remember
17 is the Acts didn't contemplate one SDR. They
18 contemplated many SDRs. And in that is the
19 tension of fragmentation or the risk of
20 fragmentation. So unfortunately, that's something
21 we all have to live with, especially you. The
22 reality though is that there are already

1 repositories for trades naturally at
2 clearinghouses and also as they occur on execution
3 venues that they be captured there. It's not
4 necessarily as Wally would suggest a Tower of
5 Babel situation if managed correctly. It's very
6 easy to take, and I would hope that any SDR
7 doesn't use necessarily a spreadsheet or a fax
8 machine these days but indeed use a commonly
9 accepted protocol and API infrastructure through
10 which this data could be collected. So whether it
11 come from SEFs or come from CCPs, it's not that
12 difficult to aggregate it such that the data
13 doesn't fall through the cracks.

14 MS. MESA: Pete?

15 MR. AXILROD: I guess I just wanted to
16 double-check something because it sounded like Kim
17 and I ended up being in violent agreement about
18 something. And I also wanted to respond to James.
19 I do think, I mean, we spent over \$100 million on
20 inventory control among other things. I think it
21 is more difficult than people might first imagine
22 if they haven't tried to do it to aggregate

1 correctly. But I'm quite happy and I think it's
2 DTCC's position that the market should and
3 probably will work itself out on this. At this
4 point we've had a lot of discussions. It seems to
5 be relatively clear that the consensus view of the
6 regulators both here and abroad is that they're
7 not going to mandate a single repository. I do
8 think though that, you know, it sounds -- if it's
9 up to the users, the people with the reporting
10 obligations to choose, I'm, you know, so be it. I
11 just want to make sure that the playing field is
12 level and that there's no sort of vertical
13 bundling of services that amounts to some sort of,
14 you know, unfair trade practices. But as long as
15 the playing is level, I think, you know, I think
16 the users themselves or the market participants
17 themselves will work it out and you'll end up with
18 what you end up with.

19 MR. TAFARA: I think I need to say I was
20 playing devil's advocate and I think it's clear
21 that the statute doesn't call for us placing our
22 finger on the scale in favor of a single point of

1 reporting. But by the same token I don't think it
2 also calls for us to put our finger on the scale
3 in favor of reporting through a clearing agency.
4 And as I think Pete is saying, if that ends up
5 being the choice of the participants, so be it.
6 But I don't think we should be in the business of
7 putting our finger on the scale one way or the
8 other.

9 MS. MESA: Verett.

10 MS. MIMS: So as a corporation I think
11 the one thing to keep in mind when we're talking
12 about these SDRs is the notion that we have an
13 end-user exemption. But in the sense like our
14 capital corporation may not and now they're a
15 reporting entity. And so we're saying we'll have
16 a single standard, I mean, for some corporations
17 we use SWIFT. We're not a member of SWIFT at
18 Boeing. And a lot of other big corporations
19 aren't. So in terms of having the standard
20 language now, you know, we still have a budgeting
21 process as well that says, okay, how do I budget
22 for being in compliance with these regs since I

1 don't know what SEFs are going to be accepted? Of
2 course, as a corporate we want more than, you
3 know, than less. And still I'd have to budget for
4 which SEF because we've used Tradeweb in the past
5 and it's, you know, it costs money. And so at the
6 end of the day it's like, you know, if we have
7 more than 20 or however many we're going to have I
8 think for a corporation there's this notion that
9 more is better.

10 But back to this notion of cleared
11 versus uncleared because we know that the regs are
12 going to set margin requirements much higher for
13 uncleared swaps. I'll give you an example. So at
14 BCC, if they wanted to as Capital Corp, they
15 wanted to do one single swap to swap out their
16 fixed rate debt to floating, they could do one
17 swap and do like a half a billion dollars in one
18 swap. And so now that I have to now do a cleared
19 trade I may have to do 500 different transactions
20 and do them more frequently. So now I have that
21 additional transaction cost. Now I have the
22 additional transaction cost of now reporting that

1 trade if I am the reporting entity which they
2 would be. So I think the one thing to keep in
3 mind, for us it just becomes more and more
4 additive in terms of cost versus the way OTC is so
5 customized now where we pick up the phone, call a
6 bank, shop the trade, hang up the phone, and
7 confirm it.

8 So I just think we have to keep all
9 these things in mind when we're setting up these
10 structures for the end user because you guys,
11 being, you know, you already have as you say the
12 natural thing is for clearinghouses do have all
13 these systems set up. Corporations do not. So I
14 just want everybody to keep that in mind when
15 setting up the market infrastructure.

16 MS. MESA: Dan?

17 MR. BERKOWITZ: I was just going to add
18 my recollections from the debate on the
19 legislation when this issue was debated in the
20 legislation. Should we have one SDR or multiple
21 SDRs? What Ethiopis was saying, as I recall it,
22 the sentiment in the Congress and certain in this

1 agency was participating in the legislative
2 process. The feeling was it wasn't -- people were
3 reluctant to decide. We determined there shall be
4 one SDR or we shall determine how many SDRs there
5 shall be. It's, let's let the market decide how
6 many SDRs there shall be. Clearly it contemplates
7 that there might not be an SDR for a particular
8 type of swaps in which case the Commission is
9 directed to essentially perform that function.

10 I would also note that there's also a
11 difference when we're talking about whether there
12 are multiple SDRs for the same class of swaps or
13 there's multiple SDRs for different classes of
14 swaps. And I think then again we'll see what the
15 market brings in terms of consolidation of
16 multiple classes of swaps and a single SDR. Or
17 we're going to have multiple SDRs based upon
18 different classes of swaps. But I think the
19 legislation clearly contemplated the marketplace
20 would decide and then the Commission would have
21 some type of rule for what the market is not
22 covering.

1 MS. MESA: Lee, did you have another
2 point? Sure.

3 MR. OLESKY: Just a quick follow-up. I
4 wanted to follow up on both those points. I
5 think, a, very important to have flexibility here
6 and a competitive environment among different
7 participants because I think that's how, you know,
8 clients will be best served. Whether they're
9 institutional clients or frankly we in some
10 respects will think of us as a SEF but we're in a
11 sense a client of the clearing corps and other
12 entities that are participating in this space. So
13 we want to see flexibility. We want to see a
14 number of different competitors because we think
15 that's the way you get the best product and the
16 best service and the best pricing. But I guess
17 the last thing I wanted to add is we need
18 certainty of timing, too, because I think that the
19 cost associated with the uncertainty that
20 continues to go on for month to month and year to
21 year is going to start to have an impact on the
22 willingness of entities to invest capital in

1 different spaces. So I can speak for my company,
2 Tradeweb, where we invest a lot in R&D. We're
3 spending a lot on technology and the longer it
4 goes not knowing precisely what the rules are, the
5 harder and harder it gets.

6 And I've got a board meeting this week
7 to go in and explain to my shareholders why we're
8 going to spend on, you know, a technology that
9 supports a certain type of trading model, you
10 know, when the impact is actually going to occur,
11 when we have an opportunity to make profits on
12 those investments. And I think the longer the
13 process goes on the more uncertainty there is over
14 the months. I think it's likely to push out
15 certain people who would invest in the space and
16 it's not going to be us because we're in it for
17 the long haul. But I think it's a cost. It's a
18 cost to our clients in terms of figuring how to
19 get set up to deal in this new environment. And I
20 think that it's not just a question of, you know,
21 the fear that things will leave the U.S.
22 jurisdiction and go to other jurisdictions. I

1 think there's also a fear that it will just slow
2 down innovation and investment and that's
3 obviously not a good thing to be doing right now.
4 I think we want to get through these rules as
5 quickly as possible so people can start to invest
6 and develop and deploy.

7 MS. MESA: Brian.

8 MR. BUSSEY: I wanted to kind of shift
9 the topic a little bit. Stay on SDR but address
10 another aspect of an international situation where
11 you have a cross border transaction. A dealer
12 here, a dealer in Europe and subject to
13 potentially different reporting requirements. And
14 I think there's two variations on this. One is
15 where the two entities are not members of the same
16 SDR. That's the first thing. And then the second
17 thing in going to Kim's suggestion from a
18 different area, what if the regulators have
19 different reporting requirements for transactions
20 that they're not completely mapped with each
21 other. So I guess I have questions both for the
22 infrastructures, the potential SDRs and the panel,

1 how you are going to deal with this type of
2 situation from a business perspective. And then,
3 for example, the intermediaries, how you view this
4 situation as working out. How the regulators
5 should best address these issues.

6 MS. MESA: Pete.

7 MR. AXILROD: I guess the nice thing
8 about the SDR situation is that there's going to
9 be a race to the top. You know, the opposite of
10 whatever the lowest common denominator means.
11 Most firms that trade in multiple jurisdictions
12 know they're going to have reporting obligations
13 in multiple jurisdictions. Not only that, for any
14 trade, multiple, you know, both parties may have
15 reporting obligations depending on the
16 jurisdiction.

17 So the only way for this to work without
18 it being a big mess is to have a reporting
19 infrastructure that will satisfy as many of the,
20 sort of what I'll call, high volume jurisdictions
21 as you can where most of the trading takes places
22 and where it's important for reporting to be as

1 automated and controlled as possible. And the
2 only way to do it is to have a reporting
3 infrastructure that as best you can will satisfy
4 all of the requirements of all of the major
5 jurisdictions. So we've built to satisfy what we
6 think are going to be the EMIR requirements.
7 We've built essentially to satisfy the proposed
8 rules. They might change but we think that's a
9 good indication of where things are going to end
10 up. We've been in discussion with Asian
11 regulators. It would be a lot easier if everybody
12 got together and had the same requirements but we
13 know that while they will be similar, they won't
14 be exactly the same in all respects. And you're
15 just going to end up with a race to the top.
16 Anyone who purports to bill just for one
17 jurisdiction is unlikely to be able to attract
18 customers. And so I think it's actually a good
19 thing rather than a bad thing as long as the
20 requirements are similar enough that it's possible
21 to satisfy all of them with one structure.

22 MS. MESA: Jonathan.

1 MR. SHORT: Yeah, I'll just amplify on
2 one thing that Kim said previously. When you
3 think about that situation where you've got a U.S.
4 entity and a foreign entity and the potential for
5 different reporting obligations, what I keep
6 coming back to is that if you're going to posit a
7 market structure where a lot of that business will
8 be cleared, the clearinghouse is a natural place
9 for that trade to reside. So if you have a
10 situation where a clearinghouse can be a SDR which
11 Dodd-Frank clearly contemplates, you could have
12 that in a foreign jurisdiction. And you know, the
13 problem seems to be addressed right there because
14 in all likelihood unless Ananda gets, you know,
15 quite liberal in what he's going to permit amongst
16 clearinghouses, that trade is going to reside in
17 one clearinghouse. It's going to be in one place.
18 And if that place is also a SDR, that situation
19 seems to be addressed at least for a cleared
20 trade.

21 MS. MESA: Steve.

22 MR. O'CONNOR: Just touching on the public

1 reporting. I think I'm going to agree with Pete here.
2 I think to the extent one trade gets reported in two
3 places, then that's a recipe for disaster. So I think
4 the industry has to move. And maybe it's covering the
5 high volume jurisdictions. But infrastructure where
6 -- and there may be multiple versions or reporting
7 infrastructure but where there is commonality of rules
8 and people understand that it's okay to add metrics
9 coming from real-time reporting system A to those in
10 system B because A and B only have one instance of
11 each trade, then that's fine. But if you have the
12 same trade going through A and B at the same time,
13 catastrophic I think in terms of the meaningfulness of
14 the numbers.

15 MS. MESA: Brian, did you have another
16 thought on this?

17 MR. BUSSEY: I'm just -- so does
18 industry just work this out then? Is that what
19 you're suggesting, Steve?

20 MR. O'CONNOR: I think that certainly in
21 the, you know, yes. But working with regulators
22 would be the easy answer. But I think that

1 clearly people have -- this has got people's
2 attention and smarter people than me are thinking
3 about these kind of issues. So I think, yes,
4 working with regulators, the industry will get to
5 the right place.

6 MS. MESA: I've just got a question on
7 predictions. So for a while there was a fear that
8 certain jurisdictions would require reporting
9 within that jurisdiction that's fragmenting or
10 causing double reporting. So if you were doing a
11 trade with -- and I don't think the fear is with
12 Europe anymore but perhaps with an Asian
13 jurisdiction. Let's just say that someone in the
14 U.S. does a trade with someone in Japan and the
15 Japanese regulators say, well, that trade is of
16 utmost concern to us and must be reported here.
17 And let's say at a repository that the U.S.
18 doesn't register or recognize and must be reported
19 to a different repository. This is the situation
20 I assume that everybody is trying to avoid, having
21 this potential double reporting. Is there a fear
22 that that exists today or is this just, you know,

1 warning, we don't want this to exist. Is there
2 something tangible that the industry is aware of
3 or -- anything?

4 MR. AXILROD: Were you going to answer
5 that question, Steve?

6 MR. O'CONNOR: No, I was hoping you
7 would.

8 MR. AXILROD: Okay. Okay. Yeah, the
9 answer is, you know, we have heard ourselves from
10 many jurisdictions outside the U.S. and Europe.
11 Essentially the refrain has been it's very nice
12 that you've developed a way to assure both
13 European and U.S. regulators that neither can cut
14 the other off from the data essentially by having,
15 you know, fully redundant data centers in both
16 places. But that doesn't do it for us. That's
17 just good for the E.U. and the U.S. And they are
18 -- everyone is taking the G-20 commitment
19 seriously and so they all think they need trade
20 repositories. They all think that they need
21 access to trades that are relevant to their
22 jurisdictions. I think they all realize that the

1 jurisdictional -- that what they have available
2 today, however imperfect, goes way beyond the
3 jurisdictional reach of any jurisdiction just
4 because per the guidelines that the OTC
5 derivatives regulators form provided, which were
6 by some miracle fully and formally endorsed by
7 over 40 regulators around the world, if there are
8 essentially offshore trades on onshore underliers
9 yet to be seen by the onshore regulator, in
10 general, you know, there may not be another sort
11 of legal way of getting at that information. So
12 this is sort of something that the industry has
13 voluntarily done. The infrastructure today allows
14 that sort of viewing of offshore trades that are
15 relevant to the onshore jurisdiction.

16 One of the things that I think is going
17 to happen if people can't stay coordinated on
18 this, is all the regulators are going to lose easy
19 access to that sort of information. Just the
20 recent sovereign debt trading is a good example of
21 why that's not good. I know that the U.S.
22 authorities wanted to understand credit default

1 swap trading on U.S. sovereign debt even if it
2 took place offshore. The Greek regulators and the
3 E.U. authorities certainly wanted to understand
4 the offshore trading on Greek sovereign debt.
5 It's easily available today. It's on a voluntary
6 basis. It's going to be very hard to make that
7 mandatory and enforce it. So there is some
8 motivation for regulators to get together because
9 there is a carrot to go along with the stick. But
10 right now the non-E.U., non-U.S. jurisdictions are
11 feeling kind of left out and are going down their
12 own path and we're trying to -- I think we have
13 come up ourselves with a way to try to manage the
14 inventory control so there's not double counting
15 but it's a little bit premature to talk about it
16 in this forum. I'm happy to talk about it with
17 your staff offline.

18 MR. TAFARA: I just wanted to probe on
19 that a little bit. The non-E.U. regulators with
20 whom you've been speaking, are they saying they
21 need a repository or that they need access to
22 information at repositories would be my first

1 question. And two, I know you've put in place a
2 program whereby access is afforded to regulators
3 around the world based on relevance. And my
4 question as how did you define relevance? How did
5 you determine what it is you would provide access
6 to and what it is you would not?

7 MR. AXILROD: With regard to the first
8 question, they want a repository, not just access
9 to the information. With regard -- oh, you want
10 --

11 MR. TAFARA: And my question obviously
12 is why.

13 MR. AXILROD: You'd have to ask them.
14 With regard to your second question, we didn't
15 come up with the definition of relevance. That's
16 -- the OTC Derivatives Regulators Forum came up
17 with a three- or four-page guidance on what that
18 was. And we, although it was voluntary, anything
19 signed by 40 regulators doesn't feel voluntary to
20 us. So we implemented that and are using the ODRF
21 definition of material interest. It's not
22 entirely clear around the edges but it's for the

1 most part a pretty good definition.

2 MR. BUSSEY: Pete, just a clarification.
3 Do they want their own SDR or a mirror-type of
4 situation that you've put in place with E.U. and
5 U.S.?

6 MR. AXILROD: It varies. Some want
7 their own SDR. Some want a mirror-type situation.
8 I think the mirror situation was put in place
9 really before we had the technology in place to
10 sort of say which regulator got to see what in
11 accordance with the ODRF guidelines. So we're
12 hoping that we can -- we don't have to mirror the
13 entire global data set in 27 jurisdictions but it
14 did seem to us as if you're likely going to end up
15 in a place where you have sort of three hot sites,
16 one in Europe, one in the U.S., one in Asia. You
17 can switch between any of the three at will. You
18 don't know which one is live at any one time.
19 It's the same technology we put in place here in
20 the U.S. It can work globally. And you have the
21 ability if one regulator sort of cuts off access,
22 which is what the other regulators are worried

1 about, that you can operate out of the other two.
2 It's not perfect. All three regulators could cut
3 off access to everybody else but that's unlikely.
4 That still makes certain jurisdictions feel left
5 out but when you look at -- the great bulk of the
6 derivatives trading takes place jurisdictionally
7 in the E.U. and in the U.S. I think actually by
8 booking location, Switzerland probably follows and
9 then Japan after that and that covers, you know,
10 well over 95 percent of the activity. I think
11 Singapore is starting to step up but that's -- I
12 think that's pretty much where we are. Those
13 aren't exact numbers.

14 MS. MESA: Does somebody have something
15 on this? Steve.

16 MR. O'CONNOR: Yeah, I would echo Pete's
17 comment. I think they do want their own SDR. So
18 the trick is selling them or building something
19 that's accessible. It's not exactly a local SDR
20 only. It's just a view of their local market from
21 the global system. And the trick is going to be
22 permissioning. And we've been talking about

1 different instances in the U.S., you know,
2 (inaudible) versus the clearinghouses. These guys
3 would have 20 versions of that confusion. So
4 that's got to be avoided at all costs. And
5 permissioning is key and in the same way U.S.
6 regulators would not want to have foreign
7 regulators particularly to see transactions in
8 U.S. product between U.S. bank and U.S. clients.
9 They would not want you to see transactions
10 between German Central Bank and German Bank in
11 euro for the same reasons. And that's the trick
12 of Pete job for the next few years I think.

13 MS. MESA: Do you have anything else?
14 Ananda, did you have another?

15 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes. I wanted to
16 ask a question about registration of SDRs. Our
17 statute does not allow us to garner an exemption
18 for registration similar to the power we have with
19 DCS and SEF, which might mean that if you want to
20 operate overseas -- well, what we cannot do is
21 recognize you if you're registered overseas. So
22 is that a good thing or is that a bad thing?

1 Well, we're stuck with it. You know, there is
2 this requirement that we coordinate with foreign
3 regulators. And so the question is should we be
4 looking at a mammoth information sharing
5 arrangement among regulators to get information
6 providing we assure ourselves that we can get the
7 information that we want? Because if you think
8 about it, an SDR is basically an information
9 gathering mechanism. Right? So the question is
10 if you are satisfied with what you get and there's
11 no cutoff of the information, why do you care
12 whether you regulate them? So. What do people
13 think about that?

14 MR. AXILROD: Amen. If you could
15 achieve that, that would be great. We're happy to
16 have multiple regulators. We're not wedded to the
17 model where everybody recognizes one regulator and
18 so forth. And if you could use -- I understand
19 that there's this indemnity provision in the
20 statute but if -- I think the ODRF is a pretty
21 good model in terms of process where you did get a
22 lot of regulators worldwide to unofficially but

1 formally agree as to who got to see what and how
2 information was going to be shared, that would be
3 wonderful.

4 MS. MESA: Brian, did you want to -- I
5 think you were going to switch a little bit.
6 Nobody had anything else on that?

7 MR. BUSSEY: I wanted to go back to
8 something that I think Kim said earlier in the
9 session. Did I hear you speaking against the
10 so-called geographic mandates that may be popping
11 up in some jurisdictions? And if you were, I
12 guess a two-part question. One for you: how would
13 you suggest that we deal with those issues as
14 regulators here in the states? And then I guess
15 to the intermediaries, how are you thinking about
16 dealing -- to the extent that we're not able to
17 deal with the geographic mandates and there are
18 going to be those in the world we're operating in
19 three years how. How are you planning on dealing
20 with those -- dealing with those types of
21 mandates?

22 MS. TAYLOR: I was speaking in a

1 cautionary way about the geographic mandates. And
2 I think -- I think I would expand what I said
3 earlier to actually apply on two levels now. I
4 think -- my concern originally was related to
5 concerns about either the execution or the
6 clearing of a transaction in a certain product
7 with a certain relevant underlying or by a certain
8 entity or the combination of product and entity.
9 There seemed to be early on quite a push by
10 regulators that I don't think is gone to have
11 those types of -- certain types of transactions be
12 required to be cleared in certain jurisdictions.
13 I think that is going to end up being problematic
14 because it's a global market and different parties
15 need to meet. And if you have a situation where
16 the same product with different entities requires
17 that it be cleared in two places, we've got a
18 problem that is going to actually show itself by
19 fragmenting the liquidity in the market and having
20 people have less access to better pricing which I
21 think was kind of one of the reasons for the
22 legislation in the first place -- was to improve

1 market transparency and perhaps to improve market
2 access. So I'm concerned about that.

3 And then I would add to it, I think,
4 this concern about the regulators mandating that
5 there be duplicative reporting in different
6 jurisdictions from the SDR point of view. I
7 really do think that -- I really do think we can
8 end up in a place where at least a cleared
9 transaction ought to be able to be reported in one
10 place, the place that it's cleared, and then there
11 needs to be a mechanism for that data to be
12 amalgamated in with data from either other places
13 where trades are cleared or other places where
14 trades are SDR'd if they are SDR'd and not cleared
15 or if they're SDR'd in different places from where
16 they're cleared. So I think there needs to be --
17 unfortunately I'm not sure I see a way for the
18 regulators to end up in a place where there's not
19 more than one location for the information. And I
20 do think as Ananda mentioned they're probably -- I
21 think it was Ananda -- that there probably is
22 going to be need to be a large regulatory

1 information sharing agreement that is kind of like
2 beyond the scope of what has been in place before.
3 I know there have been arrangements in place
4 before but they seem conceptual more so than
5 practical in a lot of cases. I don't know if
6 they're really used a lot. It probably is hard
7 for me to tell if they're really used a lot.

8 But I would think that the access to
9 information that regulators would need goes beyond
10 caring about transactions in a certain underlying
11 that would be relevant to them or I think as a
12 risk management matter you would want to know what
13 transactions, a party that you have a regulator
14 nexus with clears or doesn't clear -- the
15 transactions that AIG has regardless of what
16 entity did them or where they are cleared or SDR'd
17 or in what product they are, if it is related to
18 taking down an entity you regulate I would think
19 you'd want to have access to that. So I think
20 it's a complex problem that you need to solve.
21 But I don't think the right way to solve it is to
22 have everybody mandate, clear it here, SDR it

1 here.

2 MS. MESA: Iona.

3 MS. LEVINE: I want to move it away from
4 SDRs because we're not an SDR. And the more I
5 listen to this the more I actually think the DTCC
6 are welcomed to the market frankly. But that's
7 not our official line. However, I want to sort of
8 move us back to what you were talking about which
9 was the sort of different geographical areas and
10 what we sort of call the "balkanization" of
11 clearing. So sort of the idea that either Japan
12 or Australia or Canada would want its own
13 clearinghouse.

14 Leaving aside Japan, I think it's very
15 interesting to note that they're sort of -- 95
16 percent of all swaps are done in say four
17 different jurisdictions. And I think there's a
18 huge amount of machismo going around from the sort
19 of smaller jurisdictions. They all sort of seem
20 to be saying, well, we now want our own
21 clearinghouse in which our domestic members have
22 to be sort of clearing members. And I think

1 that's very interesting if Australia wants to set
2 itself up or somebody else wants to set itself up
3 with its own clearing members. The question is
4 who else is going to play in the sandpit with
5 them?

6 And what this actually leads to is
7 something that I'm less concerned about but which,
8 you know, my clearing members should be more
9 concerned about because if they're then required
10 to go over to various other jurisdictions and also
11 become members of those very much smaller CCPs,
12 they then have to have another completely distinct
13 booking office. They then have to become members.
14 And I don't want to see -- and this is not an
15 anti-competitive statement. I better kind of get
16 that on the table first off. I don't want to sort
17 of see a huge proliferation of clearinghouses. I
18 really don't think that's the right way to go and
19 I really think what you're talking about about
20 links and examining links and how all of that
21 works is important to throw into the pot. So I
22 want to get away from SDRs and back to

1 clearinghouses, back to should we "balkanize" it?
2 Should we allow the markets to become fragmented?
3 Or, shouldn't we just say they're global markets.
4 Let's regulate them properly. Let's not
5 overregulate them. Let's regulate them to the
6 right standard. Let's have memorandums of
7 understanding in place and let's do it properly
8 because we don't get another chance to do this
9 again.

10 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Thank you, Iona.
11 This leads to an interesting question because one
12 of the tasks that the regulatory community has
13 been challenged to look at is this concept of
14 interoperability which I believe was warded before
15 in Europe and then it died because nobody quite
16 understood what it was.

17 MS. LEVINE: It's very popular in the
18 equity space which we would say was a completely
19 different asset class. And a lot of, you know,
20 people looking at this from the risk perspective
21 don't believe it's easy. It's not easy on default
22 management. And so I think that the sort of

1 considered advice on the risk side is that there
2 shouldn't be interoperability for these more
3 complex projects -- products, rather and that it
4 should be allowed with equities. And even with
5 equities, it's slightly challenging.

6 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: The recent news
7 we've heard in Europe about I think
8 interoperability goes towards equity products,
9 cash equities. So here's a question. What do
10 people think about interoperability? Should it be
11 mandated by regulators or should it be left up to
12 CCPs to decide if they want to interoperate and
13 ask for approval?

14 MS. MESA: Steve.

15 MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you. To quickly jump
16 back to Brian's point on the interoperability, I think
17 I agree with Kim and Iona that in a world that was
18 free from the politics we would, you know, the markets
19 would choose. There will be winners and losers. I
20 think we're not in that world. I think certain
21 jurisdictions have seen a little bit already.
22 Dictate, you know, what they require in their own

1 jurisdiction. The market will just have to live with
2 that. So if there are countries that require onshore
3 clearing for certain products in their jurisdiction,
4 clearly, you know, the participants will be there,
5 which either leads to fragmented markets, which is not
6 good for systemic risk and it's highly inefficient.
7 Or you have to solve the interoperability riddle. And
8 I think that's an enormous challenge. I mean, I've
9 looked at that quite a lot and I think that the
10 challenges in the OTC markets and particularly in
11 terms of the risk management, the default management,
12 margin policy, how losses become a monumental task
13 that is sort of on the agenda at the same time as, you
14 know, launching clearing itself. So getting more
15 product into dealer clearing, launching client
16 clearing, building FCMs where you didn't have them
17 before, etcetera, etcetera. There's so much on the
18 plates of the CCPs now to have any meaningful
19 interoperability discussion is almost impossible I
20 think. As a user, we would love that further; I just
21 don't think it's feasible in the short-term.

22 MR. BUSSEY: Will you, for example, in

1 Japan will you just -- if you want to do Japanese
2 CDS, will you just have your Japanese affiliate
3 member of the clearinghouse clear the trade for
4 you as a client of the Japanese member so your
5 U.S. affiliate would?

6 MR. O'CONNOR: Well, that's starting off
7 in the interdealer space so we are there, you
8 know, we clear already through that onshore
9 clearinghouse.

10 MR. BUSSEY: Who does that?

11 MR. O'CONNOR: Morgan Stanley's local
12 subsidiary.

13 And you know, it's worth noting that if
14 I do trades with other U.S. banks or European
15 banks in yen, that's already cleared offshore from
16 Japan. So this is just for the local onshore.
17 But, you know, if intermediaries want to be in
18 those markets then they have to play by the rules
19 and that's the cost of doing business there.
20 Which may not be the right, you know, solution for
21 global systemic risk but that's where we are.

22 MS. MESA: Let's go Matthias, and then

1 Kim, and then Jonathan.

2 MR. GRAULICH: Well, to the
3 interoperability point, I think that, well, the
4 mandate of the G-20 was to reduce systemic risk
5 and I think there are a lot of studies and papers
6 out which say, well, in particular for derivatives
7 and I wouldn't limit it to OTC derivatives but all
8 derivatives, interoperability is something which
9 would introduce additional systemic risk. There
10 are so many elements which, well, are really
11 difficult to handle in particular in a crisis
12 situation. We have now this discussion in Europe
13 on cash equities. I mean, the risk is there today
14 so it's, well, manageable. But still, as Iona
15 said, it's still a challenge to get it done for
16 cash equities and it should be a market, well,
17 market-driven approach and not a regulatory-driven
18 approach. So clearly interoperability shouldn't
19 be mandated.

20 MS. TAYLOR: I don't have really
21 anything more to add to what Matthias said. Just,
22 I would just I think reemphasize the point that

1 we're a big proponent of links between
2 clearinghouses where they make commercial sense
3 and risk management sense. And I think that
4 warehousing the risk that happens with a
5 derivatives transaction is a very different
6 activity than managing the kind of t-plus x-days
7 settlement risk that comes with cash equities. So
8 I would echo the comments that have been made
9 about the -- there are a lot of downsides in terms
10 of the systemic risk protection I think that come
11 from mandating interoperability in derivatives.

12 MR. SHORT: I would echo those comments
13 and emphasize that I don't think cash equities is
14 a particularly good analogy to managing risks in
15 the broader derivatives space where you can be
16 talking about exposures that stretch out years.
17 The other thing I would just note is when you look
18 at the fundamental problem that I think Dodd-Frank
19 was intended to address, we had the financial
20 crisis with many institutions that were linked
21 together and things started to get wobbly and
22 people were afraid of one domino causing another

1 domino to fall, the idea that you're going to pass
2 a law and funnel all of this supposedly dispersed
3 OTC risk into a limited number of clearinghouses
4 and then you're going to connect all of them
5 together, that just doesn't seem like a
6 particularly good idea to me if it's mandated by a
7 regulator. If there's a point down the road where
8 it makes sense and the people that are managing
9 that risk believe that they can do it, that's
10 another issue. But to have it mandated, I think
11 is a terrible idea.

12 MS. MESA: Wally.

13 MR. TURBEVILLE: You might expect
14 somebody from an organization like mine to say
15 this is just a way for the big clearinghouses to
16 keep the little guys out. However,
17 interoperability is simply a transmittal device
18 for risk and consequence. And one foul up at one
19 clearinghouse could easily go to another
20 clearinghouse. Ba-boom. So, in fact, I think it
21 is in the public's interest for there not to be
22 interoperability. However, I think it's very much

1 in the public's interest for the regulators to
2 urge the major clearinghouses to have a form of
3 hotline, people being able to talk to each other
4 and be able to manage through events and make sure
5 that those lines of communication are out there so
6 that they can work together. But interoperability
7 itself is maybe the worst of all the
8 possibilities. I mean, a single clearinghouse for
9 the world would be better than interoperability.

10 MS. MESA: That's a statement. Ananda.

11 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: I wanted to ask a
12 question which is sort of related to what I asked
13 in the beginning of this panel session which is
14 hinted at in the morning's panel, which is as
15 follows, for those DCOs that are located outside
16 the United States. Notice, Iona, I didn't say
17 foreign DCOs. Those DCOs located outside the
18 United States. The firms have come to us and have
19 asked us to initiate a part 30-like regime, which
20 -- and I don't think, with all due respect, I
21 don't think they understand what it is they're
22 asking for because if I understand what they're

1 asking for it is let the current clearing regime
2 or clearing mechanism continue. The current
3 clearing mechanism is, for example, in ICE Clear
4 U.K., a U.S. customer has an account on the books
5 of an FCM. That FCM has an anonymous account on
6 the books of a U.K. firm. Right now that's fine.
7 That complies with the law. Once Dodd-Frank
8 becomes effective, you know, after the
9 Commission's temporary exemptive order expires,
10 that's not okay because that intermediary has to
11 be a registered FCM.

12 Now, I believe the DCOs have proceeded
13 on that assumption but nevertheless this call,
14 this cry almost for relief will not stop. I can
15 bet you it will not stop. It's already out there.
16 What do you guys -- what do you guys think about
17 it, number one? And number two, if the Commission
18 were inclined to do this, should we not also do it
19 for all DCOs? Because otherwise we may be giving
20 an advantage to some DCOs which we don't give to
21 others. Question number two. Question number
22 three, if we do this we will also have to give an

1 exemption to the segregation requirement and we'll
2 have to make clear that the bankruptcy court
3 doesn't apply because as I said in the beginning,
4 everything flows from the fact that you're an FCM.
5 So what do you think of the idea? Should we
6 entertain it or should we say part 30 applies to
7 foreign futures. These are not foreign futures.
8 These are "Dodd-Frank swaps." No exceptions.

9 MS. MESA: I'm going to let Jonathan
10 answer that. He did mention ICE Clear Europe in
11 the example. So Jonathan, do you want to --

12 MR. SHORT: Thanks, Iona. I always
13 believe in siding with the customer, Ananda, so I
14 think it's a fabulous idea what they're
15 suggesting.

16 No, I mean, I think you do kind of hit
17 the nail on the head though, when you say that a
18 lot of the protections under the act flow from
19 being an FCM. So it's not -- it's not as easy as
20 saying, okay, let's grant relief and everything's
21 fantastic. You know, I think what you described
22 at the beginning about how accounts are set up to

1 clear at ICE Clear Europe is accurate. That is
2 what happens today. That said, I think we've had
3 good uptake from our clearing participants moving
4 down the road towards getting their business set
5 up through FCMs. You know, in all candor, you
6 know, our customers are being asked to do a lot of
7 things right now and they, like everybody else,
8 have limited resources and they're being pulled in
9 a lot of different directions. So I guess I'll
10 kick it back to Iona on that.

11 MS. LEVINE: Gee, thanks, Jonathan. I
12 think that there's a difference between temporary
13 relief and sort of permanent relief. And I don't
14 think we've got any problems with the FCM model at
15 all. In fact, we've completely embraced it. It's
16 been running for some time. It's completely
17 successful. Everybody understands what they're
18 getting. They understand the segregation. You
19 know, they've all sort of stepped up to the plate.
20 I think that there's a difference where what you
21 were running with an exempt commercial market and
22 if you were running an exempt commercial market,

1 say you weren't regulated, okay, and you know, you
2 were doing it through people who run FCMs, I think
3 there is a sort of short order to switch over and
4 make sure customers get the protection through
5 FCMs. So I can see, you know, temporary relief
6 being good but I think it should be a level
7 playing field and I think it should be all FCMs.

8 MR. GRAULICH: Well, I think emphasize
9 it at the beginning. I think it's a good idea to
10 entertain that. I think reciprocity is a very
11 important aspect. I think that it's been up for
12 discussion between the regulators at the end to
13 make sure that, well, this reciprocity is
14 established. The other element on client asset
15 protection, I think what should be entertained is
16 there are different solutions to make sure that
17 client assets are protected. And this pretty much
18 depends on the bankruptcy regime in the country
19 where the CCP is domiciled. And I think there is
20 not one solution fits all. And what I believe,
21 and this is also part of the CPSS. I asked for
22 recommendations where it says, well, CCP needs to

1 make certain that it is legally enforceable or has
2 legally enforceable powers and a framework. And,
3 I mean, what you can demand, for example, is to
4 say, well, you need to show me a legal opinion
5 that this segregation regime is under your service
6 offering enforceable and I think with that element
7 you can give, well, different solutions a chance
8 or different solutions can be there for different
9 frameworks.

10 MS. MESA: Kim.

11 MS. TAYLOR: Yeah, I would -- I can't
12 help but point out that's actually where we
13 started with the customer protection mechanism for
14 the OTC derivatives. I do think it is
15 inconsistent with some of the other concerns that
16 customers are voicing at this point in time so I
17 think that would need to be certainly resolved so
18 that it's clear that we're solving the right
19 problem or that you're solving the right problem.
20 But I think the main thing I would want to say is
21 that if this were an exemption that were available
22 to DCOs that are not located here, I think you

1 would probably want to consider making it
2 available for DCOs who are located here or you
3 could find yourself, if it's an attractive option
4 for the customers, with no DCOs located here. So
5 I would encourage the level playing field aspect.

6 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: That's a good point.
7 I think, if the Commission were minded to go this
8 way, we would have to offer it to DCOs located in
9 the United States -- physically located in the
10 United States -- DCOs not located in the United
11 States, and do it in conjunction with a
12 comparability regime just so the playing field is
13 level for everybody. Otherwise, if we were to go
14 down the you don't have to register with us if
15 you're comparably regulated, that's not fair on
16 those of you who register as DCOs. Right? So I
17 think that -- this is what I think. I think you
18 can't have one without the other. And I agree
19 with you, Kim. I think if we were to allow
20 intermediation at a DCO not to take place through
21 a FCM, it shouldn't make a difference whether it's
22 a DCO located in the United States or a DCO

1 located outside the United States.

2 MS. MESA: Well, I know the time is
3 coming to an end but I just have one more
4 question. In case you feel like your one point
5 didn't get addressed today during the panel, is
6 there one issue that is troubling you? When you
7 think about the global swaps market and rules that
8 we're applying in the U.S. and the potential
9 legislation around the world, what is your number
10 one concern? Not everyone has to answer and no
11 one has to answer. But if you have something that
12 you really want to talk about, let's hear it now
13 before we conclude.

14 Okay, Pete.

15 MR. AXILROD: Yeah. Simply put, if the
16 market participants around the world have their
17 interests actually line up with the regulators'
18 interests around the world -- it doesn't happen
19 that often but I think it will happen in the area
20 of repositories just to keep market -- publication
21 of macro facts about the market accurate -- take
22 yes for an answer.

1 MS. MESA: Kim.

2 MS. TAYLOR: I think that the point that
3 I would like to make, and I probably should have
4 raised it when we were talking about comparability
5 regimes and cross recognition, is actually that --
6 I would encourage regulators to take a very hard
7 look at what I'll call the capital reserve
8 situation at clearinghouses. And for a
9 clearinghouse, the capital reserve is actually the
10 financial safeguards package, primarily the
11 guaranteed funds. Sometimes assessment power.
12 Sometimes contributions by the clearinghouse or
13 the entity that owns the clearinghouse itself.
14 But if I think back at what actually was kind of
15 the strong contributor to the crisis situation, I
16 think if I had to boil it down to one thing I
17 would boil it down to lack of appropriate capital
18 reserves at certain types of financial entities to
19 cover the tail risk on the exposures that they
20 had.

21 And the clearinghouse covers tail risk
22 in two ways. One is by margin and one is by the

1 guaranty fund. But no matter what you do with the
2 margin, you want to make sure that you have enough
3 capital reserve at the clearinghouse to withstand
4 a failure of your assumptions or a failure of your
5 model, or a set of different conditions. You can
6 always have a worst case scenario that's worse in
7 the future than anything that you would have
8 estimated in the past. And since everything is
9 being encouraged to funnel through the
10 clearinghouses as intermediaries, I think it's
11 important that they have appropriate capital
12 reserves.

13 MS. MESA: Wally.

14 MR. TURBEVILLE: I got -- this is not my
15 real point -- Kim is completely right. And I also
16 encourage folks to look at capital reserves and
17 not be bound by historic events. And I think
18 events applied to historic events are good enough
19 because there are black swans.

20 The most important thing I think is from
21 -- is the information and not the collection of
22 the information but what is done with the

1 information for both -- the trade data -- for both
2 dissemination, which was not discussed really
3 today but is actually a mission of Dodd-Frank to
4 cause dissemination to occur. And for the
5 regulators so that the information is usable,
6 uniform, and understandable on a very rapid basis.
7 And if -- otherwise, I really do fear that the
8 gathering of the information will be much less
9 useful than it could be.

10 MS. MESA: So Steve, Jonathan, and then
11 Iona and Matthias.

12 MR. O'CONNOR: If I may jump back to the
13 morning, I would say that the most important thing
14 is to have a level playing field between market
15 participants, both in the U.S. and in Europe.
16 Those playing fields don't themselves have to be
17 at the same level but when trading with clients in
18 either location the rules have to be the same for
19 all banks, all dealers in those markets. Because
20 otherwise, particularly from the U.S. bank
21 perspective it would be ironic if the reach of
22 Dodd-Frank with the U.S. going first and setting

1 an example to the world, had an adverse impact on
2 U.S. institutions and was most harmful to them.

3 MR. SHORT: I think this point has been
4 touched on in different ways but just going back
5 up to 50,000 feet I would just say that in
6 promulgating the rules that are about to be
7 promulgated, I think it's important just to
8 maintain flexibility to take into account what is
9 going to be happening in other countries. I mean,
10 I think it's a source of pride that we got
11 Dodd-Frank out and everybody has, you know, worked
12 for the last year to promulgate these rules. But,
13 you know, there will be differences in the
14 regulatory regimes and I think it's important for
15 us to maintain enough flexibility to take into
16 account what other countries may be doing because
17 ultimately all of this needs to bolt together and
18 it's a global market and what we went through is a
19 global problem.

20 I think it's good that Dodd-Frank came
21 out first but it means that you're in this sort of
22 unenviable position of being thought leaders. So

1 everybody is really looking to you guys to get it
2 right.

3 From my perspective there are a couple
4 of things. I think the thing that bothers me the
5 most and makes me sleep at night the least is not
6 the fact that the rules won't be identical because
7 I doubt if they will be identical. But it's the
8 consequences of them not being identical that
9 matters to me. Say, for example, if I'm quite
10 able to ring fence one rule and do it one way and
11 ring fence another rule and do it the other way
12 and it's still acceptable to everybody, then
13 that's fine. But if differences are not allowed
14 to persist through rules that have been
15 promulgated by the regulators, then I think that's
16 going to be a problem for the markets and a
17 problem for everybody. So let's say if we can't
18 get consistency, at least let's go to the highest
19 standard of all rules which we can live with and
20 make sure that nobody has a problem with that.

21 The second thing that bothers me is
22 actually -- and here I'll jump to this, LCH being

1 (inaudible) focus now -- it's sort of what happens
2 to my clients, my clearing members. How many
3 different kinds of entity need to join the
4 clearinghouses in how many different guises? You
5 know, I think that's the sort of thing that the
6 previous panel dealt with.

7 MS. MESA: Matthias and then James.

8 MR. GRAULICH: Yeah, I think, well,
9 reduction of systemic risk is well on our agendas
10 and there are many initiatives going on to make
11 that work. I think what shouldn't be forgotten is
12 the efficiency aspect. So we're doing a lot to
13 reduce systemic risk. Sometimes it appears that
14 it is at the cost of efficiency, so that element
15 shouldn't be forgotten. And I think one remark
16 towards the regulator, I think international
17 cooperation between regulators is really a key
18 topic which would help a lot to avoid double
19 regulation and a loss in efficiency.

20 MR. CAWLEY: Just one thing that, you
21 know, we look at is there's naturally going to be
22 a tension between, you know, rules that come from

1 Dodd-Frank here in the United States relative to
2 rules overseas. And I think that the expectation
3 that you're going to have perfect lining up of
4 rules across the world is just not going to happen
5 and one has to live with in reality. What Iona
6 said is correct, the United States has gone first
7 here and we should remember, you know, what we're
8 here to do and that is where on one hand not lose
9 the competitiveness of the U.S. capital markets
10 but also protect the American public and the
11 taxpayer. And one of the things to that end is to
12 ensure that you do have an open and level playing
13 field that's transparent.

14 And I think if you look within
15 historical context and you look back to the
16 creation of let's say the SEC back in the 30s,
17 you'll see that there were the same arguments that
18 were used. Should we delay things relative to
19 what our foreign counterparts do? Or should we go
20 ahead? And I think it's proven the test. It's
21 stood the test of time and that is that rational
22 investors gravitate towards fair, level, and

1 transparent playing fields that are consistent.
2 And I think you can look back to the '30s for that
3 for your further guidance there.

4 MS. MESA: Well, I want to thank the
5 panelists today. Your input was really important
6 and we will take back what we've learned and think
7 a little bit more.

8 I want to thank the SEC for traveling
9 our way for this roundtable and for the staff of
10 the CFTC and SEC for all their work. I just have
11 to point out Anuradha Banerjee and Warren Gorlick
12 who worked really hard from my staff on every
13 logistical detail and the substance. So thanks to
14 everyone.

15 (Applause)

16 (Whereupon, at 4:09 p.m., the
17 PROCEEDINGS were adjourned.)

18 * * * * *

19

20

21

22